

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

FALL 2015

CARL WICKLUND: A TRIBUTE

At the end of July 2015 – after close to two decades of providing outstanding organizational leadership – **Carl Wicklund**, a member of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE), ceased to serve as Executive Director of the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA). In a message to the affiliates, Carl wrote:



Carl Wicklund

After nearly 20 years at APPA, it is time to turn the reins of APPA over to new leadership. However, I am not retiring or leaving the field. I will be looking for new opportunities and challenges that will keep me involved in work of which I am passionate.

I thank each of you for your service to APPA, your dedication to the field and your support of me. As the APPA elected leadership search for my replacement, Dee Bell, will step in as interim executive director. I sincerely hope that each of you will provide support to her and the new executive director to ensure APPA remains a vibrant and important “force for positive change.”

My new contact information will be:
carl.wicklund1@gmail.com or 859-333-4088.

Gratefully,
Carl

Carl, a graduate of Gustavus Adolphus College with a degree in psychology, came to APPA in November 1996 after serving as Court Services Director for Dodge, Fillmore, and Olmsted Counties in Minnesota for six years. He also managed several community-based, private sec-

tor programs for offenders and at-risk youth in Minnesota.

As APPA’s Executive Director, Carl provided leadership to a staff of dedicated professionals, delivered meaningful conferences and training institutes, administered over 100 federally funded grants or cooperative agreements, kept the organization fiscally sound in challenging times, and was recognized as the voice of community corrections in North America.

Because of his commitment to the field of community corrections and his wealth of knowledge, in addition to serving on various APPA committees, Carl has held a number of leadership positions in professional organizations, policy task forces, and community organizations. Some of his impressive organizational involvement includes: Minnesota Corrections Association, where he served as President, Chair of the Education and Training Committee, and as a member of the Board of Directors; Minnesota Association of Child and Youth Care Workers; Minnesota Coalition for Homeless Youth; Minnesota Association of Women in Criminal Justice; U. S. Department of Justice Global Justice Information Sharing Initiative Advisory Committee, where he served as Vice Chair; National Governors Association Intergovernmental Justice Working Group; Corrections Operations Subcommittee for the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Advisory Committee, where he was Vice Chair; FBI Criminal Justice Information System’s Advisory Policy Board; National Association of Probation Executives; National Partnership on Alcohol Misuse and Crime, where he serves as Vice Chair; and the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Advisory Council of the Brennan Center for Justice.

CONTENTS

Carl Wicklund: A Tribute, <i>Dan Richard Beto, George M. Keiser, Ron R. Goethals, Christie Davidson, Robert L. Bingham, Donald G. Evans, Cherlyn K. Townsend, and Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Ed.D.</i>	1
Association Activities	5
Reintegrating Offenders into Society vs. Excluding Offenders from Society: How to Reduce Recidivism Rates <i>Jurg Gerber, Ph.D.</i>	8
Closing the Front Door on the Offender Reentry Problem, <i>Dan Richard Beto</i>	10
Reentry and the Tools for Redemption, <i>Bernard Fitzgerald</i>	13
The Second World Congress in Los Angeles, <i>Donald G. Evans</i>	16
Release Sysytem and Employment in the Social Re-Adaptation of Offenders in Poland, <i>Piotr Burczyk</i>	21
Law Enforcement’s Taboo Topic: Addressing PTSD and Officer Suicide, <i>Scott Neff, Time Whitcomb, Bonita Frazer, Dave Nowakowski, Jeannette Shields, and Robert Douglas</i>	25
The Motivation Mystery, <i>Randy Garner, Ph.D.</i>	29
From the Bookshelf	31
News from the Field	34
St. Leonard’s Society of Canada Presents the John Braithwaite Award of Distinction, <i>Robert E. “Bob” Brown</i>	38

Executive Exchange

During a distinguished career that exceeds four decades, Carl has received a number of recognitions, including: the first annual *Gisela Knopka Award for Humane Treatment of Juveniles* from the Minnesota Citizens Council on Crime in 1984; the Florida Association of Community Corrections *Lifetime Achievement Award* in 2001; the first annual *Allied Professional Award* by the U. S. Congressional Crime Victim's Rights Caucus in 2006; the *Justice Leadership Award* from Family Justice in 2007; and the U. S. Department of Justice *Leadership Award* in 2015.

Several members of the National Association of Probation Executives offered comments regarding Carl Wicklund's service to the community corrections profession.

Dan Richard Beto, the founding Executive Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas, now retired, and a NAPE past President:

I first met Carl in early 1997, shortly after he assumed the mantle of leadership at APPA. I thought he had a funny accent – he being from Minnesota – and I suspect he had similar feelings about my Texas drawl. Despite the language barrier, we became friends and professional colleagues. During the ensuing years I served on the APPA Board of Directors and on a number of APPA committees and my appreciation for Carl increased. As Vice President (1998-2000) and President (2000-2002) of the National Association of Probation Executives, I had the occasion to work closely with Carl on matters of mutual interest to our two organizations. And while we may not have always agreed, I still found him easy to work with and his company enjoyable.

Carl is a man of character, an able administrator, a consummate professional, and a great leader. He truly was a "good and faithful servant" to the community corrections profession, and his departure leaves a significant void in the APPA hierarchy.

George M. Keiser, CEO of Keiser and Associates, and formerly Chief of Community Corrections with the National Institute of Corrections:

Carl Wicklund undertook the position of Executive Director of the American Probation and Parole Association as a calling, not a job. Under his almost 20 year stewardship, APPA has grown into a nationally and internationally respected professional membership organization. Carl focused on APPA being a membership organization and insuring members received a return for their investment. Carl has seen to it that the organization never rested on its laurels but remained dynamic in taking on new challenges, not waiting for them to overwhelm the Association.

In his position he has had to work with and for many different people, many within the organization and many outside. Constantly being engaged with strong personalities and egos is an exhausting process when all is going well and a real pain when it isn't. I never

saw Carl handle his responsibilities in less than a professional, respectful manner, even when he had strong differences of opinion.

As Carl has indicated, there comes a time to move on and face new challenges while we still can. I wish Carl all the best in his new explorations and APPA all the best in filling those big shoes left by the door.

Ron R. Goethals, retired Director of the Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department and a NAPE past President:

The American Probation and Parole Association is losing a very valuable asset. Beneath his jovial, affable exterior Carl is a very serious, dedicated professional. He has always put the interest of the organization ahead of his own. APPA is a very diverse organization, a microcosm of the country itself. Members often express very divergent viewpoints reflecting opinions prevalent in the regions they serve. Rather than push an agenda of his own, Carl has always been a masterful facilitator in attempting to get the membership to arrive at a consensus palatable to all.

Carl viewed his role with APPA as one of servant rather than just leader. His superior intellect is demonstrated by his astute observations and sound decisions. One of the few times – perhaps the only time – I questioned his credibility was when he insisted that "curling" was a real sport.

Christie Davidson, Assistant Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas and NAPE Executive Director:

Over the years I have enjoyed working with Carl Wicklund and members of his staff at APPA. Most of my interaction with Carl involved coordinating the activities of our two organizations, and he was always supportive of NAPE's mission.

During his tenure as APPA's Executive Director, Carl developed a great staff that served the organization well. Much of APPA's success may be attributed to Carl's leadership, for which we are all grateful. The community corrections profession has been enhanced through his efforts.

Carl, I wish you well in your future endeavors and I hope you continue your membership in NAPE.

Robert L. Bingham, retired Chief Probation Officer for Marion County, Indiana, and a former President of NAPE:

I have known Carl for almost twenty years. I had frequent contact with him during my two stints as NAPE President. During my presidency, there were times when NAPE and APPA interests crossed paths with these circumstances potentially leading to conflict between the two associations. Bigger and better than that, Carl never

allowed ill feelings to develop as he was always respectful of NAPE, its membership, and its mission.

Carl knew the industry well as a seasoned practitioner, and he never forgot the line officer perspective despite the endless demands pulling at him as Executive Director for APPA. Carl was a true leader, not averse to taking stands and holding his ground on controversial topics.

APPA's significant growth during Carl's tenure is testimony to his vision, insight, decency, hard work, and organizational acumen. APPA is a more viable, valued, and respected association due to Carl's imprint over the years.

Strong and genuine thanks to Carl for his productive, steady, and unselfish stewardship. Quite a legacy remains, including big shoes to fill in Lexington, Kentucky.

Donald G. Evans, former APPA President and a past President of the International Community Corrections Association:

I was caught by surprise at the recent APPA Broad of Director's meeting in Los Angeles when Carl Wicklund finished his Director's report with the announcement he was leaving the position of Executive Director of APPA to seek new opportunities and challenges. After returning to my home in Toronto I found myself reflecting on Carl's considerable contribution to the field of probation and community corrections more broadly as well as his stewardship of the Association over the past 19 years. I started my association with APPA in 1978 and have watch the organization evolve from a small collection of earnest professionals desirous of creating and maintaining a voice for probation in the corrections field to a major player in the field of criminal justice. I have witnessed the struggles and efforts as well as the triumphs of previous directors of APPA to keep the Association moving forward. When Carl accepted the position of Executive Director in 1996 it was the beginning of two decades of progress interrupted periodically due to economic cycles of the boom and bust variety, but these storms were weathered thanks to Carl's leadership of the staff team and the efforts of various APPA executive teams. As Carl departs his position he leaves the Association with a highly regarded staff team, a good financial condition, and in an ideal state to breakthrough to another period of growth. This year's Institute and World Congress were both well attended and the caliber of presenters one of the best ever! He has set the target high for his successor but this will auger well for the Association and its potential future growth and influence.

On a more personal note I have watch Carl grow into a superb association administrator and at the same time seen him develop into a nationally recognized voice for the field of probation. He has served on a number of national task forces, committees, and attended numerous meetings to represent probation and maintain our presence as an important member of criminal jus-

tice agencies. All of these activities contributed to the growing respect for APPA as a "go to" organization for reports and projects and helped the Association receive grants from numerous federal and state agencies as well as foundations that assisted the maintenance and growth of the Association through good times and bad. Also, he has been extremely understanding of and helpful to those of us from Canada in keeping us connected, and not just because we know about "curling"! I am sure that growing up in Minnesota and more aware of our Canadian love of winter sports did help us being more aware of the fact that between countries our similarities outweighed our differences and I have always had a good working relationship with Carl, both as a dedicated professional and as a friend.

Carl has maintained an affinity for the various drivers of the Association and is reflected in his leadership: a voice for probation, justice for all, and a force for change. I wish Carl all the best in his future endeavors and am personally glad that he has no intention of dropping everything and turning to the curling rink! His considerable knowledge of probation and parole still needs to be involved as community corrections continues to move forward and be recognized for the important player in the fight for justice and reductions in victimization. I wish him all the best for his chosen futures and the best of health on the journey.

Cherlyn K. Townsend, former juvenile justice administrator in several jurisdictions and a past NAPE President who is now a professional coach:

As a leader, Carl Wicklund has devoted his career both to the professionals providing probation and parole supervision and to those who are supervised by them. He has been inclusive in his approach to identifying key issues, problem-solving, and innovation. His greatest strength has been to not only call upon those with many years of experience for guidance but also to call upon emerging leaders and enthusiastic professionals who are new to probation and parole. His inclusive approach, investment in professional development, and support for all leaders has served APPA and the profession well.

On a personal note, Carl was always supportive of both juvenile and adult probation and parole supervision and programs. I appreciated his efforts to bring key issues that were specific to youth/juvenile offenders to the APPA board for consideration and to include workshops in the annual institute that were often solely focused on juvenile supervision, diversion, and prevention. His legacy is all the current and emerging leaders that he has supported, the systemic approach he took to the organization and to working with partners/stakeholders, and his optimism about the role and results to be accomplished through community partnerships and supervision.

Executive Exchange

Best of luck, Carl, as you move on to new endeavors and as you define retirement in your own way.

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., a Lecturer at University of Massachusetts at Lowell, former Commissioner of Probation for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and a NAPE past President:

I'm glad I met Carl in the early 1990s. He's a true believer. And he's as passionate about the field – and, more importantly, the promise of community corrections – as he was when he started out. For example, Carl re-

cently admonished me for using the term “offender” in discussion and on a panel. Whether I agree with him on that point is immaterial to me. That he still cares enough to be concerned is what impresses me.

Carl, you have a long legacy of contributions to our profession. But I know you still have game and I look forward to your next chapter.

In summary, the community corrections profession is indebted to Carl Wicklund for his steadfast service and 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 or 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.

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

Submissions for publication consideration should be formatted for letter size paper, double-spaced, 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. Submissions 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.

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

ASSOCIATION ACTIVITIES

At the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE) Annual Members Reception held in Los Angeles, California, on July 11, 2015, three probation professionals were recognized for their distinguished service.

Sam Houston State University Probation Executive of the Year Award

This annual award, first presented in 1989, is the Association's oldest and most prestigious honor. The 2015 recipient of the *Sam Houston State University Probation Executive of the Year Award* is **Phillip L. Messer**, Deputy Chief U. S. Probation Officer for the District of Kansas.



Phillip L. Messer and Ronald G. Schweer

Messer commenced his career in community corrections as a Court Services Officer for the Lyon County, Kansas, Court Services Department in 1988. He was promoted to the position of Deputy Director of Community Corrections in Lyon County in 1990 and served in this capacity until he entered the federal system in 1992. Messer was a U.S. Probation Officer in the District of Nevada, Las Vegas Division, from August 1990 to June 1992, when he transferred back home to the District of Kansas in 1995. In 1997, he was promoted to the position of Senior U.S. Probation Officer.

The Probation and Pretrial Services Office (PPSO) of the Administrative Office of the U. S. Courts entered into a cooperative agreement with the Department of Homeland Security – Federal Law Enforcement Training Center – and established a National Training Academy (NTA) in Charleston, South Carolina, for new

U. S. Probation and Pretrial Services Officers. Messer was selected as one of eight individuals to develop the curriculum for new officer training and build the NTA from the ground floor to where it is today. He was promoted to a Probation Administrator at the NTA and relocated from Kansas to South Carolina in June of 2005. In 2008, Messer was promoted to the position of Section Chief over the Firearms Division at the NTA as the program expanded and the number of Academy staff were added in response to the demand for new officer training and specialized programs for experienced officers in the areas of firearms, officer safety, and search and seizure.

Messer returned to Kansas in 2009 as the result of his selection and promotion to the Deputy Chief U. S. Probation Officer position for the District of Kansas. In this capacity, he is responsible for all operations related to presentence, pretrial, and post-conviction programs within the District (State of Kansas). He has also continued his relationship with the NTA by serving as a program consultant to evaluate existing programs and offer his expertise in developing new programs on both the local and national levels. In addition, Messer has also served on several Program Review and Office Review teams sent by the PPSO to Districts (94) comprising the federal system. These review teams evaluate the internal and external operations of Districts and offer recommendations for changes, when justified. One must be a recognized authority in the areas of pretrial, presentence, post-conviction, and specialized areas (location monitoring, substance abuse contracting, firearms and safety, search and seizure, sex offender supervision, budget and procurement, etc.) in order to serve on a review team. Messer is often “requested” by PPSO and the NTA staff to serve on these teams as a direct result of his extensive knowledge, skills, abilities, and personality.

The Federal Judicial Center (FJC) is the training arm of the U. S. Courts for all levels of service positions – Judges, District Court, Bankruptcy, and Probation and Pretrial Services staff. Messer is currently a member of the faculty for the New Deputy Chiefs Training Program and works with other FJC and faculty staff to provide exceptional training to new court unit executives in Probation and Pretrial Services. He is also a 1999 graduate of the FJC Leadership Development Program and mentors several Deputy Chiefs in the transition to their assigned duties.

In 2011, Messer commenced a process of self-education on the subject of evidenced based practices in programs facilitated by the OPPS. He has taken the various programs, implemented them in Kansas, and taken it a gigantic step further by developing an evidence based organization (EBO) concept in Kansas. This process has involved an extensive amount of research, training of all staff levels, and in particular the education of judges to embrace the EBO strategy and implementation process. Messer has given new meaning to “mining data” from the extensive database operated by the federal judiciary. The Decision Support System (DSS) is the computer program which extracts data elements from the extensive volume of data in the system and compiles the data in a useable format for evaluating National, District, and individual performance measures. Messer is a vital member of the DSS Technical Advisory Group and is currently traveling to Districts in order to educate the field in the general benefits of using the DSS data to drive decisions and decision making.

Executive Exchange

Messer is a recognized administrator in the field of community corrections, probation, and parole. He has provided training to local, state, and federal agencies on management-related topics for more than two decades. His personnel file has literally been expanded as a result the tremendous number of Superior Performance Awards, Certificates of Appreciation, letters of thanks, and documents confirming his specialized training and assistance provided to other agencies. Messer is a member of several professional organizations and is a model for what a successful manager should be in the field of community corrections. He has presented workshops at the Federal Probation and Parole Officers Association (FPPOA) and American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) conferences, plus dozens of presentations to various professional and civic organizations.

Phillip Messer is a professional manager with the credibility, optimism, personal drive, and positive personality to get things done, said **Ronald G. Schweer**, NAPE Vice President, who presented the award. He leads from the front, not the back, and his commitment to doing the right thing is second to none, Schweer added.

Prior recipient of this award are **Barry Nidorf** (California), **Don R. Stiles** (Texas), **Donald Cochran** (Massachusetts), **Cecil Steppe** (California), **Don Hogner** (California), **T. Vince Fallin** (Georgia), **M. Tamara Holden** (Oregon), **Richard A. Kipp** (Pennsylvania), **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.** (Massachusetts), **Richard E. Wyett** (Nevada), **Rocco A. Pozzi** (New York), **Ron R. Goethals** (Texas), **Cheryln K. Townsend** (Arizona), **E. Robert Czaplicki** (New York), **Robert L. Bingham** (Indiana), **Gerald R. Hinzman** (Iowa), **James R. Grundel** (Illinois), **Joanne Fuller** (Oregon), **Tom Plumlee** (Texas), **Ellen F. Brokofsky** (Nebraska), **Christopher Hansen** (Nevada), **Sally Kreamer** (Iowa), **Raymond Wahl** (Utah), **Ronald G. Schweer** (Kansas), **Todd Jermstad** (Texas), and **Linda Brady** (Indiana).

Dan Richard Beto Award

The *Dan Richard Beto Award*, first presented in 2005, is presented at the discretion of the Association's President and is given in recognition of distinguished and sustained service to the probation profession. It is named after **Dan Richard Beto**, who served the Association as Secretary, Vice President, President, and Executive Director.

This year NAPE President **Marcus Hodges** presented the award to **Carmen Rodriguez**, a Senior Training Specialist with the Cook County Adult Probation Department in Chicago, Illinois. Rodriguez is the outgoing President of the American Probation and Parole Association.

Past recipients include **Dan Richard Beto** (Texas), **Christie Davidson** (Texas), **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.** (Massachusetts), **George M. Keiser** (Maryland), **Thomas N. Costa** (Pennsylvania), **Robert J. Malvestuto** (Pennsylvania), **Barbara Broderick** (Arizona), **William D. Burrell** (New Jersey), **H. Ted Rubin** (Colorado), and **Christopher T. Lowenkamp** (Ohio).

George M. Keiser Award for Exceptional Leadership

In 2001 NAPE created the *George M. Keiser Award for Exceptional Leadership*. This award – given in honor of **George M. Keiser**, who served for several decades as Chief of the Com-

munity Corrections Division of the National Institute of Corrections, and who had a significant impact on the probation and parole professions – is presented to corrections professionals who have demonstrated outstanding leadership qualities. This year's recipient is **Lynne Rivas** of Brazos County, Texas.



Christie Davidson, Lynne Rivas, and Dan Richard Beto

In July of 1983, Lynne Rivas – a recent graduate of Texas A&M University with a bachelor's degree in sociology – joined the Brazos County Adult Probation Department in Bryan, Texas, as a probation officer. During her tenure with the department she developed a reputation as the “go to” person when there was a caseload that needed cleaning up. During her 27 year tenure with the department, she held a variety of position, including serving as a Supervisor of the Felony Division and later as Deputy Director under **Arlene Parchman**. In addition to her duties within the department, the leadership of the Community Justice Assistance Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice appointed Rivas to serve as a Field Associate.

Rivas was one of those servant leaders who quietly went about her duties with little fanfare. She retired in December 2010 following a distinguished record of achievement with the department. This, in and of itself, would qualify her for the *Keiser Award*. But, in the words of the late **Paul Harvey**, “here's the rest of the story.”

In January 2015 the judges of Brazos County unanimously voted to make changes in the department's administration. Citing serious morale problems and a loss of confidence in the department's management, the judges wanted someone who could provide a calming and healing influence. And in February 2015 they enticed Rivas out of an enjoyable retirement to become the department's Interim Director while a nationwide search for a permanent head was undertaken. She made it clear to the judges that she was not interested in becoming the permanent Director but, based on the number of years she invested with the department prior to December 2010, coupled with her desire to see it return to the level of excellence it once enjoyed, she agreed to come back for a few months.

Rivas was just what the department needed. She calmed the department's “trouble waters” and she engaged all factions in meaningful and rational dialogue. Rivas sacrificed time with

her family to take on a task requiring unique leadership qualities. She brought to the job many of the values espoused by the award's namesake – George M. Keiser.

Because the recipient was unable to attend the NAPE Annual Membership Reception in Los Angeles due to a scheduling conflict, this award was presented at a reception held at the Brazos County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Bryan, Texas, on August 3, 2015, by **Dan Richard Beto**, a NAPE past President and who hired Rivas in 1983, and **Christie Davidson**, NAPE's Executive Director.

Former recipients of this award include **George M. Keiser** (Maryland), **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), **Robert L. Thornton** (Washington), **Mark D. Atkinson** (Texas), **Dorothy Faust** (Iowa), **Cheryl K. Townsend** (Texas), **Yvette Klepin** (California), and **Javed Syed** (Texas).

Upon learning of the selection of Rivas for this award, Keiser thanked NAPE for “insuring that dedicated, deserving people are recognized for their servant leadership.”

Reception Sponsors

NAPE is grateful to several companies who sponsored the Annual Members Reception in Los Angeles.

Companies sponsoring at the *Gold Level* included **National Curriculum & Training Institute (NCTI)** and **Track Group**.

Silver Level sponsors included **AnyTrax**, **Cisco Systems**, **Corrections Software Solutions**, **Outreach Smartphone Monitoring**, and **Smart Start**.

REINTEGRATING OFFENDERS INTO SOCIETY VS. EXCLUDING OFFENDERS FROM SOCIETY: HOW TO REDUCE RECIDIVISM RATES

by

Jurg Gerber, Ph.D.

The criminal justice system of any country has to fulfill several missions: (1) maintaining order, (2) preventing crimes, (3) solving crimes, (4) punishing offenders, (5) rehabilitating offenders, and (6) reintegrating offenders into society. It is this last function I want to concentrate on today.

The vast majority of crimes, even those that are solved, do not lead to prison sentences. They may lead to a fine, community service, probation, or perhaps a short jail term. It is the fairly serious offenders, felons, who are punished with prison terms. Depending on the society, that can be many individuals. In America, for instance, more than 1.5 million people are currently serving time in prisons (the United States is the world leader with an incarceration rate of about 700 per 100,000 people in prison – Poland, by comparison, has an incarceration rate of about 210 per 100,000). More than 90 percent of current prisoners will be released into the general population at some point. The question is not if they are released, but how prepared will they be when they are released. The general society, be it the United States or Poland, will have to accept the released prisoners into their midst.

The main problem is that many of them are not prepared to assume law-abiding roles. In some instances, *they* are not prepared, in some instances, *society* is not prepared to accept them. In either case, failure in reintegration is predictable. While methods of calculations of recidivism vary, depending on how recidivism is defined (re-arrest, re-conviction, re-incarceration, type of offense, and length of follow-up period), recidivism rates average about 50 percent in most societies. In other words, half of the released prisoners end up returning to the criminal justice system. The system is therefore not very good at reintegrating prisoners into society.

John Braithwaite: *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*

More than 25 years ago the Australian criminologist John Braithwaite (1989) published a seminal book: *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*. In this book he explored why some societies have high crime rates, while others – most notably Japan – have low crime rates. While he spent time on explaining why people commit their first crimes, these explanations are not essential in understanding differences in crime rates, because these original reasons tend to be similar in most societies. In every society, males are much more likely than females to commit crimes, the young more so than the middle-aged and the elderly, socially and economically disadvantaged more than the privileged (at least they are more likely to be arrested), and so on. What is important is understanding how societies treat criminals once they have been caught and sentenced. Most societies try to shame offenders into conformity. However, they do so differently. Braithwaite identified two possible forms of shaming: reintegrative and disintegrative shaming. In reintegrative shaming, the offender is shamed, but the shaming episode is limited in time, bonds between the offender and the community (society) are not severed, and at the

end of the shaming period there are efforts to reintegrate the offender into the community. In the case of disintegrative shaming (stigmatization), shaming is not limited in time, bonds are broken between the offender and the community, and no effort is made to reconcile the offender with the community – the offender is made an outcast. The key idea in Braithwaite's approach is simple: societies that practice stigmatization tend to have high recidivism rates (and therefore crime rates generally), and societies that practice reintegrative shaming have low rates of recidivism.

The US Today

The US is a society that has been at the forefront of stigmatization for a long time. This tendency manifests itself in a variety of ways. First, there is the idea in America that once you are a convicted felon, you are always a convicted felon. It is customary that applicants for jobs and apartments have to complete a questionnaire that asks, among many other issues, about criminal convictions. While this practice is legitimate to some extent (for instance, an employer has a right to know if a potential employee has a history of theft), it becomes problematic if an applicant is routinely disqualified from any employment. If rejected enough times, a return to a criminal lifestyle becomes more likely, and as result, the society will suffer from high recidivism and crime rates.

There are certain offenders that are especially targeted: for example, sex offenders. In all states in the US, they are required to register as sex offenders in a state registry. These registries are available publically on the internet. Convicted sex offenders are often rejected for employment and residential leases which marginalizes them. There are also many residential restrictions – for instance, they cannot live close to schools and parks – that further limit their options. There are numerous cases where families cannot live together because the father/husband is rejected on the apartment lease.

The American criminal justice system is characterized by very long prison sentences for relatively minor crimes. This is especially the case in the so-called *War on Drugs*. Possession of fairly small amounts of various forms of drugs constitutes a felony and leads to much longer prison sentences than in Europe. Similarly, sentences for crimes of violence are draconian in the US – at the most extreme end, the US has over 41,000 prisoners serving life sentences without the possibility of parole, while Great Britain had 41 as of 2012 (Center for Law and Global Justice, 2012). Even if eventually released, the consequence is that family ties and community ties are severed during long periods of incarceration and former inmates have a difficult time reestablishing them. In the end, they are marginalized and more likely to recidivate.

A final issue that deals with marginalization of former inmates is that in 48 states, felons lose their political rights. In some states they lose them for the duration of their incarceration, but in others they lose them for life [Iowa, Kentucky, Virginia, and Florida]. This issue is particularly important for the poor and

ethnic and racial minorities. They are overrepresented in prisons (and among convicted felons) and they are therefore disproportionately affected by this loss in political rights. The result is that politicians are less likely to hear their concerns and are less likely to devote resources to the needy.

Hope for Tomorrow

There are the beginnings of changes in the American criminal justice system, a move away from stigmatization toward reintegrative shaming. The period in American history when we seek to maximize punishment for its own sake seems to be coming to an end. This is caused in part by the very high costs of incarcerating people. On average, it costs taxpayers about \$31,000 to confine one inmate per year. If we then multiply this figure with 1.5 million inmates in the US at this time, the costs to incarcerate are astronomical. If we then combine these figures with the fact that about 50 percent of the inmates return after release the process becomes a vicious, expensive, and futile cycle. Fortunately, we see signs that these processes are being reversed at this time: (1) specialized courts, (2) partnerships between criminal justice agencies and community organizations, (3) probation and parole agencies, and (4) political movements each make contributions in these efforts.

Specialized Courts. Until fairly recently, courts were not specialized in the US. While there were courts of original jurisdiction and appellate jurisdiction, criminal courts heard any kind of criminal case. Recently, there has been a movement to establish specialized courts: domestic violence courts, substance abuse courts, and reentry courts, to name only a few. There has been a realization that some offenders have special needs and they need specialized services from specialized criminal justice professionals. Substance abuse courts are equipped to deal with the devastating effects of chemical dependency. If the addiction is not the focus of the intervention, any punishment for the crime is misdirected and represents wasted money. Similarly, when a prisoner is transitioning from the institution to the free society, he or she has a unique needs: employment, housing, reestablishing relationships with family members, substance abuse counseling, education, and mental health counseling are some of the pressing needs. Reentry courts have been established in many states to assist such transitions.

Partnerships between Criminal Justice Agencies and Community Organizations. Courts cannot do their work in isolation from society. Not only do they not have enough money to provide all necessary services, they also lack the resources, expertise and contacts. Community organizations, both official and non-governmental organizations (NGOs), can provide their resources. They can provide leads for employment, substance abuse counseling, assistance with securing housing, child care, family counseling, and so on. In the US, some of these organizations are church affiliated, but many are not. In either case, they serve a vital role. For instance, community organizations such as the YMCA work with parole officers to provide returning prisoners with material support.

The Role of Probation and Parole Agencies. Probation and parole agencies (and their officers) play several roles: they serve the functions of social work and law enforcement. Built into the position of probation or parole officer is a certain tension and even conflict: Probation officers have to supervise parolees and

probationers and have to serve as law enforcement officers in this capacity, while simultaneously assist them in reentry as serving as social workers. In the first instance, probationers are potential criminals, in the second they are clients. In a society that emphasizes stigmatization, probation officers are part of law enforcement. In a society that emphasizes reintegrative shaming, probation officers are primarily social workers.

Restoration of Political Rights. Reformers have started efforts to restore political rights to former prisoners. For instance, Delaware eliminated in 2013 a five-year waiting period for released felons from regaining their political rights. While such efforts are not crucial in lowering recidivism rates, they are a symbolic representation that the criminal is fully admitted into civil society.

Conclusions

There is reason to be cautiously optimistic about the trajectory of the American criminal justice system. The punitive approach is simply not sustainable from a fiscal perspective. It is too expensive and has produced very few tangible benefits. Even conservatives who have advocated a law and order approach are modifying their positions because of fiscal considerations (e.g., witness the increasing support for the decriminalization of marijuana).

However, there are also two personal reasons for me. From a philosophical perspective, focusing on reentry (and reintegrative shaming) is simply the right thing to do. Shutting out offenders by stigmatizing them is an unbelievable waste of human potential. While they may be criminals, they are still our brothers, sisters, spouses, neighbors, potential workers, and so on. Their potential is wasted and this waste is also our loss, not just theirs. Finally, the longer I study crime, the more apparent it becomes that the solutions to crime are not found in the criminal justice system. The system and its professionals play a vital role in managing crime and criminals, but solutions are to be found in the broader society. Reentry becomes possible when society is willing to readmit criminals, not when the criminal justice system deems it to be the right time.

References

- Braithwaite, John (1989). *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Center for Law and Global Justice (2012). *Cruel and Unusual: US Sentencing Practices in a Global Context*. San Francisco: San Francisco University, School of Law.

Dr. Jurg Gerber has been a member of the faculty of the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University since 1990. Formerly the university's Director of International Programs (2001-05), he has held a number of other administrative positions, including Associate Dean for Academic Administration (1998-2000), Assistant Dean for Graduate Programs (1997-98), and Assistant Dean for Undergraduate Programs (1994-97). In addition to being Director of International Initiatives, he is Chair of the Department of Security Studies. This paper was presented at the IV International Probation Seminar held in Gniezno, Poland, in May 2015.

CLOSING THE FRONT DOOR ON THE OFFENDER REENTRY PROBLEM

by

Dan Richard Beto

Last year at the III International Probation Seminar in Wrocław, the focus of that informative meeting was the issue of offender reentry, and I am pleased we are continuing with that theme this year. At last year's seminar I made the following observation:

When the subject of offender reentry is discussed, it is not uncommon that most of the conversation deals with post-confinement strategies. And while there is so much to be done after imprisonment to assist offenders, it is my sense we could eliminate a number of these problems at the very beginning of the criminal justice process (Beto, 2014).

For my presentation today, I would like to expand on that observation.

Several months ago my good friend Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., the former Commissioner of the Massachusetts Probation Department and a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives, and I had a series of conversations about a number of issues dealing with America's high rate of incarceration – one of the highest in the world. In addition to teaching at the University of Massachusetts at Lowell, Dr. Corbett serves as Project Director for the Community Sanctions and Revocations Project at the University of Minnesota Law School's Robina Institute; his project focuses on nationwide practice in the area of parole and probation revocations.

Dr. Corbett (2104) posed a series of questions and asked for written responses, which I subsequently provided. His questions were as follows:

- 1) Over the course of your service in criminal justice, did you observe any trends in probation conditions, violations, and revocations?
- 2) If so, what were the nature of those changes?
- 3) What drove those changes?
- 4) And did you see them as a positive or negative development for probation practices?

I responded to his questions collectively, rather than individually, because they were so interrelated. My response follows (Beto, 2014a):

When I became a probation officer in 1968, offenders placed on probation typically had to adhere to relatively few standard conditions of probation. Over the years we have witnessed the growth in the number of standard and special conditions of probation, and now it is not uncommon for offenders to be saddled with 20 or more. And many of these conditions now have a financial obligation attached to them. In most jurisdictions, in addition to restitution in appropriate instances, probationers are now required to pay probation supervision fees, court costs, urinalysis fees, electronic monitoring

fees, alcohol education class fees, anger management class fees, counseling fees, and fines. For persons marginally employed or unemployed who are barely eking out an existence, all these financial obligations can seem quite onerous and create a sense of hopelessness. And with the introduction of these financial conditions of probation, the role of the probation officer changed; no longer are they agents of change, but rather they have assumed the job of collection agent.

I am aware of some probation departments where more emphasis is placed on probation officer collection rates than probation success rates. In fact, in some probation departments a monthly report is posted ranking probation officers by the amount of their collections. I found that particular practice in place when I was asked to take over a troubled probation department in 1991; that practice was discontinued my first day on the job, and agency morale improved, as did the focus of the department.

A number of years ago I was addressing a statewide probation conference in Texas, and I made the statement that I hoped in my lifetime I would see a fully funded probation system, where the collection of burdensome fees was removed so that probation officers could devote their energies to assisting offenders in successfully completing the period of supervision. Regrettably, while I still hold that view, it is likely wishful thinking on my part.

It is also my sense that the imposition and enforcement of probation conditions has become more punitive in nature, and I think much of that may be attributed to the type of persons we are attracting to the probation profession and, to a degree, to those occupying the bench. I'm afraid that many judges impose conditions of probation because of personal biases and because they want to be in vogue, and not because they are necessary or relate to offender risk factors and needs.

Looking back on when I entered the probation profession in the late 1960s, most of my colleagues were former members of the clergy, ex-coaches and teachers, social workers, and persons with degrees in sociology and psychology. For the most part, they all possessed a liberal arts education, and they also had varied and rich life experiences. Over the years we have seen a significant decline in diversity in education and experience of persons entering the community corrections profession; they have, generally speaking, been replaced by people with degrees in criminal justice, and with relatively narrow perspectives on life's challenges. They have not had courses in race and ethnic inequality, social change

and development, social problems, cultural anthropology, and social control. Too, many of them have not had courses requiring critical thinking and the development of problem solving techniques. As a result, many of them have no idea about the world in which the offender lives and, sadly, many lack the intellectual curiosity to learn about that world. They, and many of the judges who impose these conditions, are unaware of and insensitive to the challenges probationers face in their daily lives – challenges to employment, housing, transportation, environment, relationships, finances, and the like. An example of this insensitivity – some may view this as minor, but it can have a detrimental impact on the existence of a probationer – is requiring a probationer to take off work to report to the probation office. This makes no sense at all, yet this is not an uncommon occurrence. While probation deals with a difficult and, at times, unpleasant population, it stills need to be more customer focused.

Now I will acknowledge there are exceptions to this – I just wish there were more.

Digressing a bit, I am persuaded that many of our institutions of higher learning are doing the criminal justice system a disservice by allowing students to graduate with a degree in criminal justice without a better understanding of human behavior and a greater appreciation of current social issues.

And finally, much of the problem may be attributed to a lack of visionary and courageous leadership in the probation profession and the judiciary; the leaders of the past have been replaced by competent but unimaginative managers.

Based on his research, Dr. Corbett developed several proposals designed to reduce the number of people entering our massive prison system. These recommendations will appear in a forthcoming issue of the *Minnesota Law Review* (Corbett, 2015):

Implement Zero-Based Condition Setting – At the moment an offender is placed on probation, the judge and probation officer, working collaboratively to set appropriate conditions, should start with a blank sheet. Or almost blank – every probationer should be required to obey the law. Beyond that, any additional conditions would have to be determined, in the instant case, to be necessary in the service of appropriate sanctioning and treatment. Most importantly, the conditions would need to be determined to be reasonable for the offender. Standard conditions – except the one requiring the probationer to obey the law – would be eliminated and conditions would optimally be few in number so that probationers, who are often without a job or financial resources and thoroughly preoccupied with survival, would have a decent chance to succeed. Setting conditions, the obtaining of which was within the reach of the offender, would create an opportunity for an experience so seldom available to probationers – a sense

of accomplishment for those offenders in dire need of that experience, earning them the commendation of the authorities and the pleasure of early termination as a reward for full compliance.

Focus on Administrative Sanctions for Most Violations – Allow probation officers, with supervisory review, to handle most technical violations with an administrative sanction such as “grounding” through time-limited curfew, or the addition of 10-20 hours of community service, or more frequent attendance at Alcoholics Anonymous, provided these sanctions were determined to be within the capacity for the offender to deal with and did not disrupt a job or schooling. The right of appeal of the imposition of any such sanctions to a judge would be provided.

Revoke Revocation – Eliminate the possibility for revocation to prison for all probationers. Probationers who are non-compliant with technical conditions would, at the most, be detained for a night or two in the local jail, but would never be revoked to state prison for technical violations. Probationers who commit new crimes would have those charges processed in the normal way, by a trial with all their rights in force. Currently, probation departments can prosecute probationers in revocation hearings for the commission of new crimes, relying on diminished standards of proof and relaxed evidentiary rules. This sort of bargain basement justice ought to be avoided as it teaches a bad lesson to the offender that the system will take advantage of due process short cuts where available. Such practices violate fundamental principles of procedural fairness.

Grant Certificates of Good Conduct to Successful Probationers – The stigma of a conviction can be a block to a variety of opportunities, most significantly, employment. Wherever the probationer behavior warrants what the military calls a “honorable discharge” the probationer should receive a certificate of impressive design that could be shared with a potential employer, indicating how responsible and mature the offender has acted during the probationary period. This could open some doors currently closed in the face of offenders.

Vouchers – In order to make positive moves – particularly with jobs and housing – many probationers may need to buy appropriate clothes for job interviews or obtain funds sufficient for a down payment for an apartment. These vouchers would be repayable by the end of probation, provided the ability to pay is established. It would act as “seed” money to give disadvantaged offenders some lift in the early days of their probation.

Visit the Other America – All new judges and probation officers should be required to stay with a family in a local housing project for a week, to familiarize themselves with the world of the truly disadvantaged. Similarly, judges and officers should be required to spend an overnight or two in the local jail or state prison. It is

Executive Exchange

unconscionable to relegate an offender to an institution, which those who are making the recommendation and cutting the order have no familiarity with. This again is “blind justice.”

If we followed Dr. Corbett’s proposals – some of which, admittedly, would not be readily welcomed by the courts, politicians, and probation personnel – we believe we could significantly reduce the number of people entering America’s prisons and, in doing so, make a considerable impact on the offender reentry issue.

Thank you for your attention. I hope these brief remarks will serve as a foundation for further discussion later in this seminar.

References

Beto, Dan Richard (2014). “Offender Reentry Issues: Identifying Challenges and Developing Possible Solutions,” *Executive Exchange*, Fall.

Beto, Dan Richard (2014a). Email responses to questions posed by Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., September 13.

Corbett, Ronald P., Jr. (2014). Questions posed via mail correspondence on September 3.

Corbett, Ronald P., Jr. (2015). This material was in an early draft of an article that later appeared in the *Minnesota Law Review*, Vol. 99, Issue 5, as “The Burden of Leniency: The Changing Face of Probation.”

Dan Richard Beto, the founding Executive Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University (now retired), is Chair of the International Committee and a Past President of the National Association of Probation Executives. This paper was presented at the IV International Probation Seminar held in Gniezno, Poland, in May 2015.

REENTRY AND THE TOOLS FOR REDEMPTION

by

Bernard Fitzgerald

Introduction: Crisis Causes Concern

In 1987 there were fewer than 600,000 people in prison in the United States. In 2007 there were 1.6 million people in prison according to *One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008*, a publication of the Public Safety Performance Project of The Pew Charitable Trusts.

The huge numbers all came about as a response to crime in the United States. It has become an inordinate response to an issue that can be dealt with in other ways. In the United States, we are becoming increasingly aware of the problems that over incarceration causes.

According to the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, a report on *U.S. Rates of Incarceration: A Global Perspective* by Christopher Hartney, the United States has 5% of the world's population and 23% of its incarcerated people. Hartney further states in his report that if the rest of the world incarcerated people at the rate that the U.S. does the numbers would rise from 9.2 million to 47.6 million.

To look at the problem in terms of where the U.S. stands in comparison to Poland, according to the Center for Economic and Policy Research, in the United States the incarceration rate is 738 people per 100,000 while in Poland the rate of incarceration is 211 per 100,000 (Schmitt, et al., 2010).

The rates have been out of control and they cause huge problems for governments, both fiscally and socially. The cost of incarceration in Massachusetts is about \$45,000 per prisoner per year. As the prison population rises so too the costs to society.

The state of California has approximately the same size population as Poland. In 2006, according to the U.S. Census Bureau, Poland had a prison population of 86,820 and California's prison population was 246,317. These numbers have brought about a mandate by the courts to reduce the prison population. In *Prisoners Series 1999-2013* by the Bureau of Justice Statistics it has been reported that California has reduced its prison population by 22% since 2006 (The Sentencing Project, 2014).

We know that most of those who go to prison will eventually be released back to society. Most will return to the places from which they came.

In the United States 650,000 prisoners are released back to society every year. Historically close to 70% will be rearrested within three years. That is why we have to begin to put more emphasis on reentry.

Elements of Reentry

Bill Keller, the former executive editor of the *New York Times*, asked the question in an article he wrote on January 26, 2014: "How do we punish and deter criminals, protect the public and improve the chances that those caught up in the criminal justice system emerge with some hope of productive lives?" This is a question that we all hope to answer in our professional lives.

Some of the answers to that question seem fairly simple. We can change our sentencing philosophy and begin to look at who

really needs incarceration and who needs diversion and treatment. If we can reduce the prison population, we can concentrate on services and effective reentry.

One has to look at sentencing as a possible cause of prison overcrowding. We have to make sure that we are sentencing the right people and for the correct amount of time. One example of this school of thought is in present day Massachusetts. Supreme Court Chief Justice Ralph Gants said ". . . Minimum mandatory sentences for drug offenses violate three fundamental principles of sentencing. The principles are: the sentence should be proportionate to the seriousness of the crime, reflect the need for just punishment, deterrence, and, where appropriate, the need to protect the public and the victim from further crimes of the defendant. The second is that the sentence should be no greater than necessary to accomplish the first principle. Lastly, the sentence should be crafted to best enable the defendant to address the problems that brought the defendant to the courtroom in order to diminish the risk that he or she will commit additional crimes. In addition, they are unfair to minority populations; they fail to address the drug epidemic; and they are a poor investment of public funds" (2015).

The moment that someone is sent to prison the process of reentry should begin immediately. The planning and assessing of the defendant are very important.

When we incarcerate someone we need to be mindful that there are fundamental questions that should be answered.

1. How will these offenders become civil and productive members of society and who is going to help them do that?
2. How do we support the communities to which they return?
3. Should they be monitored, assisted or both?
4. Does the criminal justice system sometimes impede the ex offender's success?

There are four components that must be addressed when planning reentry for offenders:

1. Employment Readiness – most offenders are deficient in this area because of learning disabilities, lack of education, lack of employment and interviewing skills
2. Substance Abuse – it was estimated in 1999 that 86.5 % of the inmates in Massachusetts's prisons could have benefited from substance abuse treatment.
3. Housing – Ex offenders have many roadblocks when it comes to obtaining suitable housing. One of the biggest problems is the rule that prohibit ex offenders from staying in public housing.
4. Public and Mental Health – Many offenders have one or both health issues and they must be addressed.

In looking at the first of these issues, employment readiness, it becomes crucial that defendants be prepared for the workplace if they are going to succeed. One program – America Works – was cited in two Civic Reports produced by the Manhattan In-

stitute (Eimicke, William B., and Steven Cohen, 2002; Yelowitz, Aaron, and Christopher Bollinger, 2015).

The program teaches practical skills like resume preparation, search strategies and interviewing techniques. They then place the offender with an employer with whom they have term relationship. In 2005 they had 1000 people in the program and 700 had jobs.

The key findings of the paper were that training designed to quickly place offenders in jobs significantly decreases the likelihood of rearrest. It was also discovered that the quick program is most successful with the non-violent offenders. It was much more cost effective with those offenders.

Another help to employing offenders is making it more difficult for the employer to make decisions based on prior criminal histories. "Over reliance on background checks inevitably screen out qualified and trustworthy employees," notes "Haunted by the Past: A Criminal Record Shouldn't Ruin a Career" in the March 2015 issue of *The Atlantic Monthly*. Massachusetts, Georgia, and New Jersey have passed laws to prevent this discrimination.

The second component of importance is the treatment of substance abuse. Many in the United States are beginning to realize that prescribed treatment of substance abuse can actually be used in lieu of incarceration. Drug Courts are being instituted in many parts of the country. There are substance abuse programs in most prisons.

Housing is a major concern for those being released back to the community. It is essential that offenders not be released back to the street as homeless. If that happens it is almost a guarantee that the person will reoffend.

Many offenders in custody suffer from health issues. They must be treated and there must be followed up to insure that the treatment continues. One can't assume that when a defendant is released that he/she will continue to take their medication after release.

In short, when we release without preparation and planning, it becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy that people return to poverty and unemployment and it increases the likelihood that they will be arrested again.

Helpful Practices for Reentry

There are a number of things that would help enhance and strengthen reentry programs.

Common Sense Sentencing – Make the punishment fit the crime. Save serious prison time for the most serious offenders. Try to rehabilitate non-violent offenders in the community with enhanced resources.

Supervision – Use shorter periods of supervision of those on probation. The longer the period of probation the more likely that the offender will commit a technical violation. There should be quick and certain responses to violations.

Enhanced Resources – There is a need for more community resources to make sure that offenders coming out of prison do not return. There are a number of specialty courts that are helpful in this area; Drug Courts, Mental Health Court, Domestic Violence and Veteran's Court.

Post Release Supervision – It is essential that if we spend the proper amount of time preparing people for release that we must try to insure that they follow through with the program.

Developing Pro Social Relationships in the Community – Encourage ex offenders to seek out a new peer group.

New Practices and Programs

Since 2010 the U.S. Department of Justice has supported the Justice Reinvestment Initiative, which has assisted state and county governments in their efforts to move to cost effective, evidence based practices to generate savings while still focusing on public safety (Council of State Governments, 2014).

Probation made big changes. Instead of supervising everyone with the same intensity they became focused on those who were at a high risk for reoffending. They then changed the way that they handle infractions for the lower risk offenders. They can respond more swiftly and use sanctions other than prison. They have access to more programming for those offenders. Probation officers now have the option of sending those low risk offenders to programs like cognitive behavior counseling and substance abuse treatment. Electronic monitoring is another tool available to them.

If those forms of progressive discipline don't have the desired effect, they are now empowered to commit the offenders for short periods of time.

Inside the prisons The Justice Reinvestment Act created a sentencing option called Advanced Supervised Release. If a prisoner takes advantage and completes the cognitive behavioral programs that are designed to decrease the likelihood of reoffending then they are eligible for reduced sentences.

Post release supervision has also been included in the JRA. All felons are now subject to from 9 to 12 months supervision after release.

As a result of the implementation of the JRA the State of North Carolina, ten prisons have been closed, the number of probationers being revoked has decreased by 50%. The prison population has decreased by 8% and admissions have dropped by 21%.

Boston Reentry Initiative (BRI)

In response to an increase in violent crime in the year 2001, the Boston Reentry Initiative was born. It is a program that targets high-risk offenders between the ages of 17 – 30. It is a collaborative program with partners from the District Attorney's Office, The Boston police Department, the U.S. Attorney's Office, the Suffolk County Sheriff's Department, The Massachusetts Probation Department and the Massachusetts Parole Board. The Youth Options Unlimited Program Community Resources for Justice and the Whittier Street Health Center are also collaborators. Members of the police department, the probation department and the U.S. and Suffolk County District attorney's offices identify potential participants. When they are admitted to the facility they appear before a panel that includes all the law enforcement partners and community partners that provide social and employment services.

Each of the components makes a presentation. The law enforcement partners stress that the offenders have managed to draw attention to them and would be heavily scrutinized when they are released. The community and religious partners present a number of services that will be available to them both inside the walls and when they are released.

If the offenders choose to avail themselves of the services offered them they are assigned to a case manager. The offender and the case manager then map out a tailored release plan. This plan may include participation in programming in prison and also programs transitioning back to the community.

From 2010-2014, 447 offenders took advantage of this program. More than 53% of those have remained arrest free or have a subsequent charge of a lesser nature. Less than 4% of the men were arrested on a greater or more serious charge.

The goals established for the Boston Reentry Initiative include:

1. Increase public safety particularly in crime ridden neighborhoods;
2. Reduce recidivism of the target population by 50% over five years; and
3. Support Long-Term Successful Reintegration Of High Risk Offenders.

Overcoming the Odds (OTO)

OTO is an offshoot of the BRI program. It targets high and moderate risk offenders being released from state prisons and returning to Boston. Most of the same partners participate in this also.

One month prior to release the offenders attend a panel similar to the one that the BRI offenders attended. They are offered services upon their release and are warned that they will be monitored carefully after their release.

On the day of release the offenders are scheduled to meet with either probation or parole officers and also with case managers to initiate their reentry plan. They make appointments through their case managers to meet with service providers.

Case managers take part in community reintegration; they work with the offenders around the issues of physical and psychological health, employment, education, housing, family reunification, and substance abuse.

The goals for this program include:

1. Reduce recidivism of state level offenders;
2. Increase positive community reintegration for state level offenders;
3. Increase data sharing and cooperation between law enforcement, correctional and service provider organizations to support successful reentry and community reintegration;
4. create and sustain a city-wide approach to prisoner re-entry.

In conclusion, the biggest impediments to a successful reentry policy are the easy access employers have to criminal records, the lack of planning on the part of society for those being re-

leased, and the mandatory sentencing procedures that still exist. Since we know that most who are incarcerated will be returning to society and to the places from which they came, we must find a way to prepare them for that day and to provide meaningful opportunities for them. Without opportunities the whole dream of rehabilitation and reintegration collapses.

References

- Bender, Alex, and Sarah Crowley (2015). "Haunted by the Past: A Criminal Record Shouldn't Ruin a Career," *The Atlantic Monthly*, March.
- Council of State Governments (2014). "Justice Reinvestment in North Carolina: Three Years Later," November.
- Eimicke, William B., and Steven Cohen (2002). *America Works' Criminal Justice Program: Providing Second Chances Through Work*. New York: The Manhattan Institute, November.
- Gants, Ralph (2015). Remarks by the Chief Justice at the University of Massachusetts-Boston, March 16.
- Hartney, Christopher (2006). *US Rates of Incarceration: A Global Perspective*, National Council on Crime and Delinquency, November.
- Keller, Bill (2014). "America on Probation," *New York Times*, January 26.
- Public Safety Performance Project (2008). *One in 100: Behind Bars in America 2008*. Washington, D. C.: The Pew Charitable Trusts, February.
- Schmitt, John, Kris Warner, and Sarika Gupta (2010). "The High Budgetary Cost of Incarceration," Center for Economic Policy and Research, June.
- The Sentencing Project (2014). "Fact Sheet: U. S. Prison Population Trends," Washington, D. C.
- Yelowitz, Aaron, and Christopher Bollinger (2015). *Prison-to-Work: The Benefits of Intensive Job-Search Assistance for Former Inmates*. New York: The Manhattan Institute, March.

Bernard Fitzgerald was the Chief Probation Officer (now retired) for Dorchester, Massachusetts; he is member of the International Committee of the National Association of Probation Executives. This paper was delivered at the IV International Probation Seminar held in Gniezno, Poland, in May 2015.

THE SECOND WORLD CONGRESS IN LOS ANGELES

by

Donald G. Evans

Introduction

Following the successful first World Congress held in London, England, in 2013, the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) agreed to host the second congress in the United States. APPA invited the International Community Corrections Association (ICCA) to join as co-host of the second congress held in Los Angeles, California. The congress convened after the APPA annual institute and ran from July 14 to 16, 2015. Over the course of two years, the hosting associations planned and programmed the event which brought together researchers and practitioners from around the world to share information and innovations in the field of community corrections.

The specific objective of the first and second congress was to draw attention to the generally ignored efforts of supervising offenders in the community. There is an abundance of conferences and conventions as well as academic studies on the subject of incarceration and more recently on mass incarceration. What is ignored both in the public media and the academic publications is the issue of the supervision of offenders on probation, parole, and other community sanctions. Two examples are sufficient to make the point that community supervision is largely invisible in comparison to imprisoned populations: in the United States there are two million incarcerated and nearly five million on some form of community supervision, while in Europe approximately two million are in custody and over three and half million are supervised in the community. A number of the workshops addressed this issue, especially Dr. Michelle Phelps from the University of Minnesota who explored the issues surrounding the development and expansion of mass probation. Additionally, Dr. Rueben Miller from the School of Social Work at the University of Michigan addressed the problem of re-entry by looking at research in two areas – Chicago and Detroit. Dr. Miller examined the points of re-entry and the neighborhoods the offender returned to and argued for the need to re-think the scope and reach of our re-entry practice. These examples underscore the need for convening global conferences to make visible what has been generally an invisible aspect of the criminal justice system.

I am encouraged by the growth of community-based efforts to assist those being supervised in community settings and especially the innovative efforts being initiated locally, regionally, and nationally in various countries around the world. However, we must find ways to maintain and grow this international effort that convenes in different regions and brings researchers and practitioners together to not only share what works but how it works and to make the work of community supervision more visible to governments and the public! This second congress was comprised of three plenary sessions with twenty supporting workshops over a two day event. There were 375 participants with over a hundred delegates from outside the United States. There were 29 international presenters that provided a wide range of coverage of what is occurring around the world in community supervision.

Opening Session

Congress co-hosts Scott Taylor, Past President of APPA, and Phil Nunes, President of ICCA, welcomed the delegates to Los Angeles and to the second World Congress and outlined the agenda.

Two speakers were introduced to the audience in the opening session – Peter van der Sande, President of the International Corrections and Prisons Association (ICPA), and Willem van der Brugge, Secretary General of the Confederation of European Probation (CEP). Both speakers were actively involved in hosting the first world congress in London and in their remarks made a clear connection to the purposes and objectives of the congress past, present, and in the future.

In his remarks, President van der Sande noted that only a strong co-operative partnership between like-minded organizations can promote the “future outside of prison outside the prison.” He remarked “that in general the existing penal system is too much focused on retribution” and as a result “imprisonment is used as a political and managerial instrument to ensure a greater security in society.” When commenting on the consequences of imprisonment, he noted that they are more than a loss of freedom of mobility and may lead to collateral damage that can seriously affect the future of offenders returning to the community. President van der Sande views collateral damage as “a punishment after the initial punishment, it is an additional penalty to a punishment.” He told the delegates that he sees “no future for the classic prison system,” but that we continue to incarcerate millions of our citizens worldwide. He argued that we need to be “aware that this non-reconciliation-oriented incarceration system is still growing” so that currently there are more than 10 million people held in penal institutions worldwide. He concluded his remarks with a passionate appeal “that together in common efforts we find ways of persuading politicians, policymakers, and citizens” that there are more effective and rationally-based considerations that can be used other than an overuse of incarceration. “It is my firm belief,” he said, “that one day our professional contribution will perform as a generator, as a strong flywheel of change in the judicial and correctional system.”

The second speaker at the opening session was Willem van der Brugge, who brought greetings from CEP President Marc Ceron, who was unable to attend the conference, and in a concise manner explained to the audience the role and function of the Confederation of European Probation. He then went on to stress the importance of a worldwide exchange of probation practice and knowledge and made the following points:

- Prison population worldwide consists of people who have been excluded from rather than included in society. It is an understatement to say that people leaving prison are often not well enough equipped with sufficient social skills to make a successful transition from prison to society.
- We all know that for high-risk prisoners leaving custody the chance of re-offending is high. In Europe up to

50% if those released have returned to prison within two years.

- Nowadays radicalization and the dangers caused by extremists are a paramount concern of criminal justice systems all over the world. Cross-border crime requires cross-border mechanisms to fight it. It makes the need for worldwide judicial cooperation between countries urgent. We all know prisons have a significant impact on the risk of increased radicalization and strengthening of extremist communities. Sooner or later those ex-prisoners can or will become probationers and it is clear that probation professionals will need to learn how to recognize and manage radicalization.

On the basis of these remarks, Mr. van der Brugge then stressed the importance of a worldwide exchange of probation practice and knowledge as well as gatherings such as this congress to give probation workers from all over the world the opportunity to understand each other and to share practice knowledge and to engage in training regarding specific types of probationers. He ended his remarks by stating that we need to invest in research, knowledge exchange, and best practices.

The opening session ended and the congress progressed to the first plenary session, which was delivered by Dr. Laurence Steinberg from Temple University in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Age of Opportunity: Lessons from the New Science of Adolescence

The title of Dr. Steinberg's plenary lecture is the title of his recently released book on the same subject published by Houghton Mifflin in Boston, Massachusetts, in 2014. Based on his lecture I would suggest that this would be an important read for anyone interested in adolescent development considering what the science of adolescent brain development has to offer probation staff working with either juveniles or young adults. Trying to summarize his lecture would be a difficult task and the best I can do is to highlight some key points Dr. Steinberg made and to recommend his book for those who wish a fuller explanation of his approach. Dr. Steinberg noted the following thoughts from his research for our consideration:

- Adolescence now lasts longer and the adolescent brain is surprisingly malleable;
- Adolescence is a period of significant change in brain structure and function;
- Adolescence is not just a time of change in the brain's structure but also a period of important change in how the brain works;
- No simple answer to the question when does an adolescent brain become an adult brain;
- Adolescents mature intellectually before they mature socially or emotionally;
- Adolescents are highly susceptible to the influence of their peers; and
- Self-regulation is important for adolescent success and well-being.

Dr. Steinberg also discussed the implications of his research for parenting, influencing policy makers, and for the criminal justice system. In this brief lecture he provided answers to some

of the myths surrounding adolescent development and stimulated the audience to think about our interventions with adolescents and young adults. His work demonstrates the adolescent brain's potential for change that offers the possibility of developing strategies for instilling resilience, and self control, especially in the youth we are working with. There is no doubt that Dr. Steinberg's plenary session created a buzz and lots of discussion early in the congress.

The second plenary session was delivered by Dr. Jennifer L. Skeem, Professor and Associate Dean of Research at the School of Social Welfare, and Professor at the Goldman School of Public Policy at the University of California in Berkeley.

What Works for Justice-involved People with Mental Illness

Dr. Skeem commenced her presentation with an overview of the current situation facing corrections in regard to offenders with mental illnesses. She noted that: mental illness cases currently swamp the criminal justice system; people with mental illness are overrepresented in the system; most of these people have co-occurring substance abuse disorders; and the majority are supervised in the community and unfortunately often "fail" on supervision. Dr. Skeem then discussed what she called the "implicit model of what works" regarding mentally ill offenders (sentenced to treatment or a specialty program, who receive psychiatric services geared to symptom control with the expectation of a reduction in recidivism) and discussed what she regarded as problems with this model. Dr. Skeem then unpacked this implicit model and discussed the problems associated with the model such as "symptoms rarely cause crime and psychiatric services rarely reduce crime." The presentation then shifted to a discussion on refining the model and examining promising directions for working with mentally ill offenders. She suggested three possibilities: target robust risk factors; employ core correctional practices; and continue psychiatric services.

The last section of this encouraging wedding of research and practice presentation was devoted to a discussion on refining the model of "what works" for mentally ill offenders by connecting the sentence to treatment or specialty probation program with both psychiatric services and correctional services, and noting that when this has occurred there was a reduction in recidivism. She noted that in a study comparing traditional and specialty probation offenders (methodologically and statistically matched probationers with mental disorder) that specialty probationers were less likely to be re-arrested than traditional counterparts but this finding was not because of symptom reduction! The interesting aspects that came out of this study and others was to note that offenders with mental illness have more general risk factors than their counterparts and that these factors predict recidivism more than factors related to mental illness. This leads to the conclusion of the importance of targeting robust risk factors. The second promising addition to the refined model was the use of core correctional practices and again there is evidence to support the importance of the quality of officer-offender relationship as an explanation for the positive effect of specialty probation. The dual role relationship of controlling and caring are critical to achieving change and also includes a reduction in reliance on punitive strategies and an emphasis on problem-solving strategies.

Dr. Skeem concluded this stimulating and positive presentation with a surprising ending; first she noted that specialty probation is cost effective but not attributable to criminal justice savings, instead the cost effectiveness is based on treatment savings; secondly, she implied that the risk-needs-responsivity (RNR) model can be seen as useful but that we should resist rushing to the next “evidence-base scheme too rapidly and with too little data.” By this last thought I take it that she was suggesting that we continue our efforts to work with the RNR model but to gather data and refine our approaches in light of the evidence, continue to improve our implementation of programs based on the model, and to robustly train staff in the core correctional practices.

The Workshops

After these sessions there were twenty workshops on a variety of topics for the delegates to select four that they wished to attend. Unfortunately this meant making difficult choices as all the offerings were worthy of attending and as a quick glance of the program would indicate the material was rich in content and varied in terms of its international representation. Topics covered included: Innovations in juvenile and family justice in Japanese community corrections; Lessons from HOPE probation in Hawaii; Mass probation and the retreat from mass incarceration; The community return program in Ireland; Implementation lessons of GPS tracking programs in South Korea and Taiwan; Partnerships to provide innovative mental health services in England; Post-prison desistance from crime in the Netherlands; and Strengthening community-based alternatives to prison in East Africa.

This array of subject matter made it difficult to choose what to attend and eventually what to comment on. Therefore, I applied a couple of simple rules: I would attend international presentations on the basis that I was less likely to be able to hear these presenters at other frequented conferences; and secondly, I looked for presentations that would be covering current topics of my own interests such as prisoner re-entry and re-structuring of probation services in response to mass incarceration. What follows are brief descriptions of the workshop presentations that I attended and found interesting and insightful.

Challenges and Issues in Re-entry

Gerry McNally, Assistant Director of the Probation Service of Ireland, presented an overview of a Community Return Program to supervise qualifying offenders who complete unpaid work as a condition of their early release from prison. The project was a joint effort between the Irish Probation Service and the Irish Prison Service. Mr. McNally provided a description of the program and a summary of the evaluation of the project. Eligibility for the program was open to offenders who were serving one to eight years and had served half of their sentence, were positively engaged, and were adequately assessed as candidates for this pilot project. The conditional release contained special conditions that included: two or three days each week of unpaid work (a form of community service); the number of weeks required were calculated and made clear through the terms of the release; and only two work absences were allowed. There was an 89% compliance rate and the main reason for breach was for the

second absence. The recidivism rate for the project after three years was 51%. The general outcomes, based on the evaluation, were: 9,580 weeks of community return were completed; 1.8 million Euro worth of unpaid work was done for the community; there was an increase in pre-release education and rehabilitation participation; and a reduction on the prison population. Participants in the program noted the following benefits: the value of structure and routine; work and its relation to self-esteem; developed work skills; and was a help in them staying out of trouble. They did voice some particular challenges, such as: the strictness of signing on conditions; access to social welfare payments; time involvement; and cost issues. Mr. McNally concluded the presentation by noting some key recommendations the evaluation report made regarding the program. Especially noted were: further development of the assessment process; participants' accessibility to welfare payments; improvement to work site numbers and proximity; enhanced partnership arrangements with state, community, and voluntary agencies; and improved pre-release preparation.

Again the similarities of the issues present themselves, especially in the area of gaining support and in the development of robust partnerships between government and non-governmental entities. It seems that for community-based programming to be successful it requires a broad community of coordinated effort.

Ioan Durnescu from the Faculty of Sociology and Social Work at the University of Bucharest, Romania, presented an informative and stimulating overview of his current research project on prisoner's transitions that focus on Roma and Romanian prisoners finding their way back into society. The aim of his research is “to develop an advanced understanding of the re-entry process from the prisoner's perspective.” The research is to be conducted in two locations – Romania and Norway – and will include both Romanians and Roma offenders. Professor Durnescu's presentation was based on preliminary findings that included ten participants, both Roma and non-Roma, located in Romania and dealt with the first survival month. The pre-release perceptions of these participants relative to their prison experience and to how they imagined their release were recorded. They experienced prison as a loss, as pains of imprisonment, or as a learning and growth experience, and tended to imagine release as a great happiness, a re-birth, or new beginning, but also viewed it as a reunion, rest, and recovery and for some a period of uncertainty.

Of interest in these preliminary findings was the discussion of “welcome rituals” that occurred when the offender was released from prison. Three categories were distinguished, heroes (especially from the Roma and from large families), family men (one to three people waiting from the family) and lone crusaders (one relative or friend waiting). The rest of the presentation looked at the issues in the first month of release and noted that there were two phases, a recovery phase that occurred in the first two weeks and an activation phase that followed. The question, of course is what comes next, and Professor Durnescu hopes to find out as the study progresses, but for now it is a question of whether reintegration or relapse. In concluding his presentation Professor Durnescu provided the following practice implications for practitioners:

- Support the family while offenders are in prison and after;
- Pre-release programs involving partners and children outside;

- Personalized employment interventions;
- Prepare employment while in prison;
- Focus on adaptation and the family in the first two weeks of release;
- Focus on work and a new identity after the second week of release; and
- Work on the respectability package: family, work and identity.

This was an informative and useful presentation for those working in re-entry programs and I am looking forward to the results of this study when it is completed.

Restructuring Probation Work

Perhaps the most ambitious effort to date has been the “transforming rehabilitation” agenda in England and Wales, an initiative that was announced at the first World Congress in 2013 and is now in place as of the Spring of 2015. Jim Barton, Deputy Director of Development and Business Change with the National Probation Service, a division of the National Offender Management Service for England and Wales, and Steve Pitts, Senior Advisor in International Justice with the National Offender Management Service, presented an overview of the “transforming delivery of probation services in England and Wales” in which they explained the background to and the evolution of the government’s agenda. The main components of the new structure are: the public sector (National Probation Service and Her Majesty’s Prison Service); the private sector; and third sector (community contracts and custodial contracts). In 2010 the Coalition Government made a commitment to reform the probation service by doing the following five activities: opening up the market; incentivizing through payment for results; recycling savings to extend services to short term prisoners; aligning prisons with community provision; and creating a National Probation Service.

They also discussed the drivers for the system design that included a desire to lower reoffending rates, provide greater support to offenders upon release from prison, and a commitment to opening up the market to the private and third sector providers. To accomplish this, 35 probation trusts were organized into 21 community rehabilitation companies and a single National Probation Service. The caseload was re-assigned so that one third (high risk offenders) would be the responsibility of the National Probation Service and two thirds would be assigned to the community rehabilitation companies who would then contract for services with local providers. These reforms will be supported by continued efforts arising from their approach to commissioning for services. There is no doubt that this reform has attracted both its supporters and detractors and there is considerable academic interest in these developments. It will be interesting to monitor these reforms and follow the progress that is made or not made in delivering probation services more effectively and efficiently.

The workshops at the congress were excellent and dealt with current issues in community corrections; I am hopeful that some if not all of them find a wider audience either by publication or are presented at other conferences.

The final plenary presentation was given by Fergus McNeill, Professor of Criminology and Social Work at the University of Glasgow in Scotland.

Community Corrections: Rethinking the Purpose, Scale and Shape

Professor McNeill began his presentation by reviewing a number of stated purposes for community corrections and suggested how each of these purposes might be measured. For example, if our purpose was promoting community corrections the measure might be an increase in market share, or if the purpose was victims’ interests the measure could be the victims’ satisfaction with process and outcomes, and if it was the offenders’ welfare the measure would indicate an improvement in inclusion and well-being. Professor McNeill then asked the question “what do we want community corrections to be?” He suggested there were two viewpoints to answering this question – a “pessimistic vision” and an “optimistic and constructive vision.” Moving on from a brief discussion of how people experience correctional supervision, Professor McNeill explored how we got to this place in the history of community corrections. He noted the growth in the volume of those supervised in the community, the geographical distribution of that population, the intensification of conditions upon which they are released, and the resulting neglect until recently of the effects of “mass supervision.” He examined the general arguments for expanding community corrections: less expensive and less harmful than imprisonment.

Professor McNeill turned his attention to a discussion of the scale of community corrections and, using the research of Michelle Phelps (who had presented a workshop earlier in the congress), noted three points for our consideration:

- Probation growth can accompany prison growth (and contribute to it);
- Probation growth can restrain prison growth (and perhaps contribute to ending mass incarceration); and
- Probation growth can have a null effect on prison growth.

From this he then discussed the possibility of probation as decarceration and suggested some factors that need to be taken into account if we are to avoid net-widening:

- Probation’s systemic context needs to facilitate and incentivize penal reductionist goals (through political and sentencing reform);
- Probation needs to be effectively targeted and its practices need to be effective; and
- Probation management of breach/violations needs to be careful and considered.

He made a brief comment on containing growth of community corrections by noting that “we cannot and must not assume that community corrections and its growth is an unqualified growth and like prison, its use must be parsimonious and proportionate, and subject to human rights safeguards.”

The final part of his presentation dealt with how we should reshape community corrections and based on his work on desistance suggested reshaping to support desistance from crime. Desistance, he noted “is a process of personal human develop-

ment that takes place in and is shaped by its social and cultural contexts, hence also a social transition that involves movement away from offending and movement towards successful social integration, citizenship and participation.” It involves three key components: behavior, identity, and belonging. Desistance is at the center of our efforts to promote integration as a positive good. In his concluding remarks Professor McNeill summed up his presentation by reminding us that:

- Desistance and integration are social processes not just personal transitions;
- Correctional supervision of transitions is not the same thing as support; and
- Integration of all citizens is a human right and a duty of the state and of civil society, even the responsibility of all citizens.

This concluding plenary session brought the second World Congress to an end and was an excellent summarization of the dialogues and discussions that had ensued during the two day event. With these presentations participants were given much to think about and to reflect upon that would aid them in their efforts to promote safer communities, improve offender well-being, and assure victims are cared for and receive the support they need.

Japan to Host Next World Congress on Probation in 2017

The Japanese delegation, made up of representatives from four organizations who are hosting the next World Congress, closed the second World Congress with a video inviting us to assemble in 2017 in Japan. The four organizations are the: Japanese Association of Offenders Rehabilitation, Japanese Rehabilitation Aid Association, Rehabilitation Bureau Ministry of Jus-

tice, and United Nations Asia, Far East Institute (UNAFEI) for Crime Prevention and the Treatment of Offenders.

Conclusion

As we look forward to the next World Congress in Japan, there are a number of challenges and issues facing community corrections that can only benefit from a careful consideration of what we have learned at this congress and an effort to move forward on the basis of the growing body of knowledge that has developed and continues to develop globally. We need to be more attuned to what is occurring in other jurisdictions and in academia and find ways of communicating and exchanging ideas and information that encourages the development of our intellectual and social capital so that we can better manage our political environments. Our ideas should not be confined to separate groups or associations where only the “converted” are exposed to arguments in favor of what we are doing! We need to create a strong presence and develop and maintain a public space in which we can form global alliances that allows us to build capacity for reflexive action on community corrections. An action that would permit us to move out from under the shadow of the prison wall and into the public light! This second World Congress, like the first, has seen friendships develop, partnerships emerge, and the promise of continuation that will reach out rather than inward.

Donald G. Evans is a past President of the American Probation and Parole Association and the International Community Corrections Association, and serves as Contributing Editor to *Executive Exchange*. He is also a member of the International Committee of the National Association of Probation Executives.

RELEASE SYSTEM AND EMPLOYMENT IN THE SOCIAL RE-ADAPTATION OF OFFENDERS IN POLAND

by

Piotr Burczyk

Today – during the IV International Seminar – attended by our friends from the United States, we will continue the discussion on the very important topic, mentioned previously during the III International Seminar in Wrocław in 2014, and extended this year to include the issue of offender's work and its educational dimension. The issue attracted great interest and we decided to continue it here, extending the content and substance of our discussions. The topic is important from the point of view of the judiciary system, but also from the social perspective: it concerns the Polish and American systems of releasing offenders from correctional facilities, and their employment as an element of social re-adaptation. Only the system that is well organized may guarantee effectiveness and the expected level of safety in the society, which is one of the fundamental responsibilities of the state.

Today we have the opportunity to describe and compare two systems – Polish and American – taking into account particularly the employment of inmates and offenders post-release, either on parole or after having served the sentence in full. It will also be an opportunity to consider whether the current schemes indeed fulfill our expectations or if they require major changes. The fact that we are accompanied by so many established practitioners and representatives of academia, from both Poland and the United States, guarantees high level of discussion with regard to both research and practice. Hopefully, it will allow us to arrive at some interesting conclusions, and it will perhaps be useful in our work.

The Polish Release System and Current Issues

I will first offer a brief description of the Polish release system, followed by remarks on the impact that work has on offenders and their social re-adaptation, based on current regulations and on my own experience – as I have practical knowledge on probation. It is an important task in the release system, to prepare an inmate for his/her release from the correctional facility. The preparation process includes a variety of actions, which involve different social actors. For the majority of offenders, that means social re-integration and what is commonly known as post-penitentiary assistance. The participants are mainly the staff of correctional facilities, probation officers, but also the institutions involved in the organization of social welfare, NGOs, religious associations – as defined by Article 38, par. 1 of the Polish Executive Penal Code, and Article 39, par. 1 of the Executive Penal Code, which in turn lists the tasks of these entities. This helps us realize that the process of re-entry is indeed a complex one; it requires different actions and a broad range of institutions and organizations. It is difficult to say precisely when the preparation to release and re-entry begins, if only because there is no precise definition of the term in the literature. So we may conclude that it is a scope of actions and reactions, which is strictly related to social reintegration

and post-penitentiary assistance. If we assume that the main aim of imprisonment for the offender is to refrain from committing a crime and compliance with social rules after release, then we may say that the entire period of imprisonment should be a preparation of the offender to be released, to be free.

Let me now tell you about the most important regulations of the Executive Penal Code, and particularly Chapter 7 of the Code, entitled Social Participation in the Enforcement of Judgments, Assistance in the Social Reintegration of Offenders, and the Victim Support and Post-penitentiary Assistance Fund.

The chapter contains Article 40 which provides for the establishment of the Main Council and Regional Councils for the Social Re-adaptation and Convict Support. The legislature defined the role of these councils and entrusted in them the coordination of cooperation between state bodies and members of the public in crime prevention and enforcement of judgments, as well as providing assistance in the social reintegration of convicts, and exercising social control and assessment of the penitentiary policy.

I would like to comment on these tasks, particularly on the tasks of the Regional Councils for the Social Re-adaptation and Convict Support. This is so important from the point of view of the Probation Service and the entire system of probation, including the policy of releasing convicts from prisons. The cooperation of various government institutions, local authorities, non-governmental organizations (NGO) dealing the social re-adaptation of convicted persons should take place at various levels of activity, ie. in the area of competence of district courts, including the area of municipalities and counties.

On the first level of activity, the initiative in organizing and coordinating the integrated cooperation system of various entities working towards the social re-adaptation of convicts should belong to the Head of the Probation Office and probation officers (See article 11 par. 3 of the Act on Probation officers). On the second level of activity, in provinces, the perfect opportunity for the practical functioning of the integrated cooperation system may lie in the regional councils for the Social Re-adaptation and Convict Support, which – as their name suggests – have been established to work precisely in this area. In this case, the initiative to appoint the Councils should, among others, come from the Regional Probation officers. Such Councils, the Main and Regional ones, comprises the representatives of main governmental institutions, local governments, scientific bodies, NGOs, and other representatives when needed. The Councils are therefore a forum for exchanging opinions on the social re-adaptation of the convicts in the area of their competence, the social supervision of the executions of penalties, and on directing the post-penitentiary assistance. The Regional Councils are important bodies, with significant social standing. They are capable of reviewing the various activities and direct their opinions and comments to representatives of government institutions, local governments, correctional facil-

ities, etc. Regional Councils may also issue opinions and effectively support the programs implemented by non-governmental organizations related to social re-adaptation of convicts. The work of the Regional Councils, which includes such a broad spectrum of representatives of various entities professionally and socially involved in the social re-integration of convicts, provides an opportunity to establish direct contacts and to develop an integrated system in the province of their cooperation to improve the activities related to the social re-adaptation of convicts. Such an objective, in my opinion, should guide the work of probation officers in local communities, at different levels of their operation.

However, as a practitioner who worked in such a council as secretary and who became familiar with its capabilities, I feel somewhat dissatisfied with the fact that so far only eight councils have been established in the whole of Poland, while there should be many more – as many as there are provinces. I think it is an institution that has not yet fully been appreciated in Polish correctional policy. Therefore, I urge the appointment of such councils in those judicial districts where this has not been done. I will return to this institution later when we discuss the impact of work on the social re-adaptation of offenders, because it has a lot to offer in that area as well.

Another very important element in the functioning of the release system in Poland is called the Post-Penitentiary Assistance Fund provided for in Art. 43 of the Executive Penal Code, which defines the procedures for the establishment and the spending of the fund. This is a very important for offenders released from correctional facilities and for their families. Today, it is the professional probation officer who is responsible for administering the fund. I believe it is an appropriate solution, and the effectiveness of the fund and spending depends on the officer's policy, that should be based on the applicable regulations. It is well known that in local communities former convicts are stigmatized; those who want to change their behavior have a more difficult start in life and require the assistance of specialized institutions, including probation officers; not only is it in their best interest, but also in the interests of the local community in which they work and live. For the primary aim is to reduce recidivism and raise the level of public safety. Practice has proven that failures of the post-penitentiary assistance, i.e. if the convict does not receive it in the first period after re-entry (up to three months, sometimes longer), in most cases make him return to crime and in this way he becomes a serious criminal risk for the local community. Such a person, after leaving the correctional facility, usually is already in a state of crisis resulting from difficulties in the adaptation to life in the free world – especially after a long period of imprisonment. Therefore, the policy in this respect requires reliability, relevance, and effectiveness in decision-making by the Probation Service. I know from conversations with probation officers conducted during courses and training, that the situation in the provision of post-penitentiary assistance has significantly improved compared to years past, when it was grossly insufficient. I believe it gives us hope for the future.

The Executive Penal Code and the Role of Probation Officers

The Executive Penal Code provides for the following cases of releasing convicts from prisons:

1. parole or conditional release of the offender as an alternative from serving the remainder of sentence;
2. release of prisoners after serving the whole of the sentence; and
3. there is another, a third option – a non-custodial sentence – where the offender remains in the community with limited freedom, in accordance with the applicable regulations of the electronic supervision act.

In the case of parole and electronic surveillance, probation officers are of utmost importance. The legislature has entrusted them with the task of supervising or controlling the offender during probation and supervision of convicts under electronic surveillance.

Finally, in the Polish legal system, there is another opportunity of releasing violent offenders under the Act of 21 January 2014: after serving their total sentence of imprisonment they are isolated in a specialized center, which gives the possibility of treating these dangerous criminals – the perpetrators of the gravest of crimes. I still think, as a lawyer, that it is a controversial act, established to suit the current needs, and dangerous in terms of both its creation (stretching the law) and its functioning. In my opinion it violates fundamental rights and civil liberties. Such isolation is actually an extension of the term of imprisonment and becomes a dangerous penalty precedent. In the legal community it is still a legal act arousing serious doubts and controversies.

In the Executive Penal Code the legislator imposed on probation officers in the Polish system of releasing convicts from prisons a broad range of responsibilities and powers, and so:

1. Art. 41 par. 1 and 2 of the Executive Penal Code – defined tasks of probation officers in the social re-adaptation of offenders;
2. Art. 164 par. 1 of the Executive Penal Code – entrusted, among others the probation officers with preparing offenders to parole;
3. Art. 165 par. 3 of the Executive Penal Code – obliged the offender to determine the extent of necessary assistance in the social re-adaptation with the probation officer;
4. Art. 171 par. 2 of the Executive Penal Code – provided for the assistance of probation officer in the social re-adaptation of offenders during the probation period;
5. Art. 173 par. 1 of the Executive Penal Code – provided for organizing and conducting social re-adaptation activities for offenders in order to prevent recidivism; and
6. Art. 173 par. 2, point 7 – defined the right of the probation officers to to apply for a waiver and cancellation of parole. And Section 12 of said Article defined the steps a probation officer may take to prepare the convict to be released from prison.

I refer to these legal tasks of probation officers, particularly professional officers, in the release system, as they are very important in the implementation of the system of releasing

convicts from prisons, but I will not develop them now in detail, but I will leave it for the discussion. However, my goal is to signal the fact that the regulations of the Executive Penal Code provide for such important work of the Probation Service, and yet probation officers are not always equipped with the appropriate tools for their implementation.

As to the tools, I mean the relevant executive facilities and tools to support the specific objectives and tasks of re-adaptation carried out by probation officers. In particular, I'm talking about those offenders who are released and have nowhere to go, as they do not have a permanent or even temporary residence. They are condemned, ostracized by their families for the prior mistreatment of family, failing to fulfill their maintenance obligation and neglecting the family, or people who are child molesters, sex offenders, etc. In such cases what can the probation officer do? After all, if these people are left in the local community without proper supervision during the probation period, they will be a threat to public safety and prone to recidivism.

I believe there is, however, a chance to show such offenders the right path to freedom. We should develop a system and appropriate facilities and tools that will allow for actions and possibilities of social re-adaptation of offenders that are more effective than today. After all, re-adaptation is the right of the offender, and he should be able to use it. This situation leads me to offer some proposals for discussion, especially some proposals for you, as probation officers.

Establishing Hostels in the Polish Legal System

In my opinion, such re-adaptation centers (hostels) for offenders would meet their purpose in our practice. Article. 164§1 of the Executive Penal Code provides for an institution – preparing the offender for parole or release after serving the sentence of imprisonment. This is the period during which the convicted person prepares to a new life after being released from prison. In this process, apart from the penitentiary service, the role of the probation officer is crucial. However, there is a certain gap in the system. An offender who is homeless or rejected by the family – does not have a permanent place of residence – usually after leaving prison returns to the criminal community and returns to a life of crime, posing a risk to the legal order in his local community. I think that in the Polish penitentiary system there is no intermediate link between a correctional facility and freedom, which could help such offenders gently land in the conditions of freedom, where they could constructively progress through a period of adaptation, under their consent. Such a link can take the form of a hostel, with adequately prepared program and staff. I will continue to promote the idea for the creation of such hostels in Poland.

I had the opportunity of visiting some of such hostels in a probation officer's district in Sheffield in the UK. And at the invitation of American partners I got to know the management and operation of such hotels in the US. After these visits I came even more convinced that my actions were right. I encourage probation officers to take action in this regard. I am convinced that it is worthwhile.

Therapeutic Programs

Another very important task of the Polish criminal justice system is the implementation of specialized therapeutic programs – also related to the preparation of offenders to being released from prisons. A significant issue in the process of re-adaptation and social re-integration of offenders lies in the effective implementation of assistance activities, including professional therapy. In correctional facilities there is already a variety of different therapeutic programs, and it's very good. However, most of these programs, to be able to fulfill their tasks and goals, should be continued after release. And that does not work so well, I'm afraid. Also the staff of correctional facilities know how important it is to continue the programs out-of-prison, after offenders are released. It is the role and task of the Probation Service to continue these programs in freedom.

The acquisition of therapeutic programs and their implementation is obviously very expensive, but in my view it is necessary if we are serious about the progress in social re-integration and assistance for offenders released from prisons. It is not only NGOs's task, but also the task of the central and local governments. We must hope for the cooperation of these entities, including the probation and the penitentiary services.

Offender Employment Issues

Now I would like to share with you some comments about the employment of incarcerated offenders as a very important educational element in the social re-integration, both during the imprisonment and after release. Employment of prisoners is one of the principal means of affecting the offenders. The employment of the majority of offenders fulfills not only the ideas of social economy, but it also has economic advantages as well.

The educational dimension of employment consists in offenders obtaining:

1. professional experience, training in the social role of a worker;
2. establishing relations and cooperation with colleagues outside the prison community;
3. exposure to social control of the so-called normal people (non-offenders);
4. the possibility to gather their own money for the time after being released from prison;
5. the opportunity to participate in maintaining the family, and fulfilling the maintenance obligation; and
6. the ability to repay financial liabilities.

Professional relations in the out-of-prison context shouldn't be underestimated as well. This may result in the possibility of continued employment after the release. In practice it may ensure independence after the offender's release from prison, thus relieving the social welfare system and us, as taxpayers.

We all know that the work is one of the oldest ways of influencing offenders in penitentiary isolation. It disciplines prisoners, teaches them self-reliance, being organized, coping after being released from prison. Referring to the problems of social reintegration of former prisoners, and taking into account the prospect of their life in freedom, it becomes an indisputable matter that we should allow offenders to take up employment during imprisonment. The role and function of the measure of

activation is emphasized in the scientific literature. The functions most commonly indicated in the literature are: re-adaptation (educational); the socialization; health and hygienic function; economic function; the function of strengthening security in prison; and the function of preventing the demoralization of offenders. The role of offender employment during imprisonment has been recognized in international constructs binding our country within the framework of the European Union.

The fact that the issue of prisoners employment was regulated internationally proves the relevance of this issue. A very important issue concerning the paid employment of offenders in freedom, after release from prison, is the possibility of obtaining employment in the local community. It is not an easy task. Often the offenders are stigmatized in the community. Therefore, they need help from the local community, and from specialized agencies, including the probation officers, who as I mentioned before are obliged to offer it under the Executive Penal Code. A very important institution, which is focused on this issue is the Main Council and Regional Councils for the Social Re-adaptation and Convict Support. These councils have the tools to influence the development of the offender employment system in their areas of operation, this I know that from my experience, having served as a secretary of the Regional Council of the Wielkopolska province. I sincerely hope that the issue will be referred to and commented on in more detail by the representatives of science and practitioners in other speeches and in the discussion.

Conclusion

I know other speakers will also present their points of view on the functioning of the system of releasing offenders from prisons and on the employment of prisoners, emphasizing this very important element in the social re-adaptation of sentenced persons in Poland and the United States. The scientific ideas and comments will be very interesting, as well as the remarks offered by practitioners. Such an exchange of opinion always brings positive final effects to both parties. I am particularly interested in learning how the system of releasing offenders from correctional facilities and their employment possibilities are handled in the United States.

Thank you for your attention. I wish you all an interesting meeting and fruitful discussions that will bring us all valuable conclusions.

Piotr Burczyk, who recorded a distinguished career in the Polish criminal justice system, is Director of the Probation Officers Academy of Poland (CSKS), a division of Business Communication Group (BCG), headquartered in Piła, Poland. This paper was presented at the IV International Probation Seminar in Gniezno, Poland, in May 2015.

LAW ENFORCEMENT'S TABOO TOPIC: ADDRESSING PTSD AND OFFICER SUICIDE

by

Scott Neff, Tim Whitcomb, Bonita Frazer,
Dave Nowakowski, Jim Banish, Karen Howard,
Jeannette Shields, and Robert Douglas

The need for critical incident stress management (CISM) for emergency responders has never been greater. Statistics consistently show that law enforcement is one of the most stressful occupations. Suicide is the leading cause of death for police officers and occurs two to three times as frequently as line of duty death. Rates of post traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) are alarming, and range from 10% to 24%. In addition, rates of divorce, substance abuse, and other stress related issues are highest in the law enforcement population. Because of the high-risk nature of policing and the chronic stress that is often inherent in the job, those who protect and serve our communities deserve special care, attention, and resources.

Recognizing the need for comprehensive services to address critical incident stress in law enforcement, Associate Training Technician Scott Neff from the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services developed a program designed specifically to provide a forum for understanding stress, recognizing the prevalence of post traumatic stress disorder and suicide within law enforcement, and identifying the need for additional resources for officers in need of more further care. The program – TRAUMA (Trauma Resources and Unified Management Assistance) – is a 2-day training which was first launched in December 2012 and has been presented in a total of 14 locations across New York State since its inception.

Neff writes, “In my experience with the TRAUMA program, I think the one thing that really stands out is that there are lots of officers that need and will accept help, but have been unwilling to seek it on their own, or have been unable to find a resource that worked for them. It is a similar situation to what Tim Cook of Apple said ‘Apple has made products for years that people didn’t know they wanted and now they can’t live without . . . , that’s how I see it. Law enforcement officers are not going to stand up and say “hey, lots of us have serious issues and need training addressing PTSD and officer suicide” yet the need was acknowledged immediately by those who attended the training. The need is almost immeasurable, and we’re just scratching the surface. The possibilities for related courses are huge. We recently offered our first Law Enforcement Peer Training Class and the response was remarkable.

“I believe that the success of the program lies in the real life experiences of the presenters, the gritty, raw and often times the unfiltered delivery hits fiercely. There is no sugar coating in this training . . . it’s up close and personal. After years of being relegated to the back burner, this direct hard-hitting approach is having its intended effect. The presenters’ willingness to relive their own trauma to show that it’s possible to overcome PTSD and cumulative career traumatic stress is a powerful teaching tool. This is not theory or supposition; rather, it is a harrowing look into a dark and dangerous time in a law enforcement officers’ life. We are very fortunate that these incredibly strong individuals are willing to revisit these painful events and share

the lessons they’ve learned. In doing so, they explain that any officer can fall victim to the toxic work environment inherent their career, and anyone can hit their own dose exposure limit.

“Often attendees will identify with a specific presenter and approach them for direction, support or a referral. This is where the program really excels because it guides people to a path for recovery and supports return to a “normal” life. The response to attendees by presenters has prevented several suicides as a result. TRAUMA has also shed light on the giant gap in the treatment community, and we have learned that there are very few therapists that have the specialized training or experience that prepares them to address law enforcement specific issues. This is a specialty area and the law enforcement community is in serious need of appropriate resources that can provide effective treatment for their unique challenges. The lack of referral services is one of our biggest frustrations. Experienced and successful therapists are severely overworked because they know how badly they’re needed and they take on more and more clients. This is something we were not prepared for when we rolled out the program.

“As referenced in the training, the struggle on the street to survive is only half the battle, it’s the aftermath that law enforcement has historically not been taught to deal with. For years we told officers to ‘*rub some dirt on it and get back in the game*’ and regarded that method as an acceptable way to cope with trauma and critical incidents. That approach has never worked, will never work and the costs have been tremendous. Suicide, divorce, alcohol abuse and other issues that negatively impact the quality of life are far too common in law enforcement. It’s essential that we teach officers that they are not flawed and they are not weak. Nothing could be further from the truth.

“One of the goals of TRAUMA is to influence a culture shift in law enforcement, to make it common practice to ask for help, to teach topics in basic training that promote good self care from the start and support maintenance of wellness throughout their career. We want to prevent them from reaching a critical point which may create a need to save them from themselves.”

“Since September 11, 2001, many in this nation and this Congress have a deeper appreciation for the importance of the sacrifices made by our Law Enforcement officers.”

- Jerry Costello

The opening speaker of the TRAUMA training is Cattaraugus County Sheriff Tim Whitcomb who identifies a number of situations that have resulted in critical incident stress. The most significant event occurred on August 18, 2009, when former Sheriff Dennis John committed suicide. Whitcomb writes, “I was his Undersheriff at the time and he was one of my closet

colleagues and best friends. Personally I found the event profoundly tragic. His departure immediately made me the Sheriff, and as the Sheriff I administratively witnessed first-hand the devastating affects his suicide had on our agency of some 230 employees. I challenged myself and our chain of command to respond to this tragedy as an opportunity . . . an opportunity to educate all of our personnel in a much more effective way to help keep them safe. Part of our response was to prepare and conduct training specific to post traumatic stress disorder and law enforcement suicide. The goal was to educate, protect, and insulate those people who have chosen to protect and serve.

“This mission is a challenge. The culture of law enforcement can be resistive to embracing emotional or psychological injuries. The reality is that these injuries can be diagnosed, addressed, and managed unequivocally. Providing law enforcement administrators, first and second line supervisors, and line officers with a solid foundational training of PTSD: what it is, where it came from, how it occurs, what its signs and symptoms are, and how to manage it, is imperative information to keep first responders safe and keep their quality of life intact.”

Bonita Frazer, a clinician who has been active with the Western New York (WYN) Police Helpline since its planning stages in 2005 and implementation in 2008, provides information on critical incident stress. In her presentation she reviews the typical and not-so-typical reactions to critical events and identifies the most prominent warning signs that someone is at risk for developing PTSD or other mental health disorders. Factors that affect an officer's ability to recover from critical incident stress are also reviewed. Frazer writes, “This training has been one of the most influential programs I have been involved with in my 38 year career. Attention to the needs of law enforcement is long overdue and officers and departments alike will benefit greatly from understanding the impact of stress on personnel.”

Through her involvement with the WNY Police Helpline, Frazer knows of many officers who have been helped by the cadre of specially trained Peers who provide assistance on a 24/7 basis. Users of the service have needed assistance in a variety of issues ranging from the need for a referral to suicide prevention. From this experience, Frazer also discusses the development of the Helpline and provides case examples of persons who have been helped. She notes, “Since the implementation of the TRAUMA training, many departments across New York State have recognized the importance of developing peer programs for their officers; support for these programs has gained greater momentum as a result.”

According to the October 2014 Issue of *The Police Chief* (http://www.policechiefmagazine.org/magazine/index.cfm?fuseaction=display_arch&article_id=1244&issue_id=82007):

The goal of peer support is to provide all public safety employees in an agency the opportunity to receive emotional and tangible peer support through times of personal or professional crisis and to help anticipate and address potential difficulties. Ideally, peer support programs should be developed and implemented under the organizational structure of the parent agency. These guidelines are intended to provide information and recommendations on forming and maintaining a

peer support structure for sworn and non-sworn personnel in Law Enforcement agencies.

Dave Nowakowski, a retired Investigator from the Oneida County Sheriff's Department, gives a commanding presentation addressing the line of duty death of a member of his department. His story is very well received by the audience because of its hard-hitting nature. Nowakowski states, “June 6, 2011, was the last day of normal life for me. It was the early morning hours of June 7, 2011, that a barricaded suspect opened fire on us with a shotgun. A young Deputy was shot in the throat a few feet in front of the patrol car I was in. The next shots were aimed at me as I returned fire through the windshield.

“Although I survived my deadly force encounter, I was not prepared for the psychological battle that would come afterwards. My battle with PTSD took over my life and a lot of my suffering was due to a lack of knowledge of what was happening to me.

“My goal is encourage Departments to have a plan in place to take care of surviving officers and to share my story with fellow officers to reach the ones suffering in silence with PTSD. I want to try to shed the stigma attached to PTSD in law enforcement and to show that PTSD is not a death sentence.

“Although PTSD will always be a part of me, through treatment I have learned to live with my PTSD and not suffer with it.”

“We may not be able to control life's circumstances, but we always have a choice about how we use our minds to respond to them.”

- Elaine Moran

Another TRAUMA team member, Warren County Sheriff's Office Patrol Officer Jim Banish, gives a moving account of the tragic loss of his brother, Lieutenant Joe Banish of the New York State Police. During his presentation he identifies several issues as follows: “The TRAUMA program has brought to the front stage what everyone has known and only talked about behind closed doors. As I began my career in law enforcement it was obvious that this was its own culture that had its own way of life. You either accepted it or you moved on to another career field. I was taught early on in my career that I was not allowed to react and expose my feelings within this culture, even after the line-of-duty death of a friend. As police officers we are not expected to have any reaction to very traumatic incidents. In fact we are just supposed to move on to the next case or incident as if nothing ever happened.

“Years of subjecting someone to these traumatic incidents, combined with the police mentality have proven to take its toll on law enforcement officers around the world. My experience of dealing with my brother's suicide, who died while on duty and in full uniform, almost destroyed my life as well. As one of the first responders to that scene I left a piece of myself there and brought back a horrifying and traumatic experience that haunted me for years to come and still to this day. The TRAUMA program has allowed me to help others by showing them that there is a road “home” and that with the proper help, they too can live a healthier life and deal with their cumulative career traumatic stress and PTSD on a daily basis. I hope to inspire those who need the help, and won't get it because of the stigma attached to “getting help”. It has long been regarded as

a sign of weakness within the law enforcement community but is slowly starting to change, mostly because of people like Scott Neff. This ridiculous ideology that police officers are 'super men' and are not allowed to have emotions is in my opinion the epitome of ignorance. I am proud to work with my TRAUMA family and hope to continue to save lives for as long as I am able. This type of training is long overdue within our culture."

One portion of the training is given by mothers of officers killed in the line of duty and addresses the family perspective of death notification and the aftermath in the days that followed. Both moms describe to the audience what went well and what aspects of the notification and subsequent contacts with the department caused an increase in difficulties for them.

On April 25, 2007, David C. Brinkerhoff, New York State Trooper and member of the Mobile Response Team, was killed in the line of duty. His mother, Karen Howard, shares her perspective based on the tragic loss she endured.

"My experience is with the New York State Police Employee Assistance Program. I can't say enough about what that support meant to the family and David's co-workers. It is a time of extreme numbness, confusion and grief. Every agency needs a policy (program) in place to assist families and co-workers at this time. The support is key to the healing and well-being of all affected by the traumatic event. The TRAUMA trainings have allowed me to talk to law enforcement who can institute a plan if they don't have one, or can improve on the plan already in place. It gives me the opportunity to convey the importance of support needed. Speaking to law enforcement about the process allows me to heal a little more. It has afforded me the opportunity to witness other speaker's stories, pain and healing. TRAUMA gives me the opportunity to stress the importance of having a plan in place no matter how small or large the agency. Support is needed by families and co-workers . . . it's vital to healing, wellness and future."

Jeannette Shields also lost her son in the line of duty. On October 30, 2002, Officer James Shields died in a fatal car accident. Shields openly discusses her experience during TRAUMA trainings and notes, "When I was invited to speak to Law enforcement officers, my goal was to discuss what went right and what went wrong with the initial notification. I let the officers know what we as the family need from their department and how comforting it is for us to maintain contact on an ongoing basis. Since that time, I have also come to understand what my son's co-workers went through after Jimmy died. Support for the family and departmental members is equally necessary."

Family members need and deserve consideration from police agencies following line of duty deaths and other critical incidents. They are part of the police family and continued contact from officers provides essential support and aids them significantly in their recovery. The loss of contact with the police officers serves to increase their sense of isolation and causes unnecessary distress. Both mothers understand that the death also has a tremendous impact on the agency, and they advocate for a mutual exchange of support between the family and the department. All benefit as a result.

Had effective and coordinated departmental procedures been in place in both instances, the families would have experienced a sense of comfort instead of greater anguish in the aftermath of their tragic loss. As such, during their presentation each mom emphasizes the need for extensive and comprehen-

sive pre-incident planning which includes effective and continued support for the family.

Anchoring the program is Retired Baltimore Police Officer Robert Douglas, Founder and Executive Director of the National Police Suicide Foundation, Inc. He has been a featured presenter with TRAUMA from the start. Douglas writes, "As Executive Director of the National Police Suicide Foundation, Inc., I am so excited about the opportunity to work the New York State Division of Criminal Justice TRAUMA Team under the leadership of Scott Neff. Starting in 2015 we will be the launching pad for changing attitudes as we address this major challenge of mental health/suicide prevention throughout the State of New York. In the past several years I have observed many state-wide programs developed by law enforcement organizations throughout the 50 States, but there is only one such program that stands out among the rest: the New York State TRAUMA Program for law enforcement personnel. This 2-day program stirs emotions and enhances understanding of the mental health issues our officers face each day in their professional career. Neff and his passionate team of law enforcement/clinical professionals identify the emotional and physical issues confronted by law enforcement and provide guidelines on how to effectively address these symptoms. I professionally believe this model should be used nationwide in our other 18,000 agencies throughout the United States. I have found in leadership that true leaders do more than control the direction of the people they are leading. The leader has a vision for their destination, they understand what it takes to get there and with confidence and trust of the people, they will reach their goal. The TRAUMA program improves the ability of all law enforcement officers to address the emotional issues of their profession and better equips them to understand and manage stress. I am so proud to be part of such an event."

TRAUMA strongly advocates for the development of peer support programs. It is a significant component of any comprehensive approach to law enforcement stress and utilizes specially trained personnel to provide support for members of their department. The peer offers a distinct and significant viewpoint in response to the stress intrinsic in the job. In addition, the peer can connect more effectively with other law enforcement personnel because credibility and trust are rapidly established. Law enforcement personnel have typically not accessed employee assistance or mental health programs because professionals in those fields are often perceived as too intellectual or unaware of the demands and intensity of their work. Officers are far more likely to speak with a peer rather than access traditional services. Therefore, development of 24/7 Peer Support Services will increase the likelihood that officers will request assistance for issues that impact work and family life. Such programs will keep personnel in service, lead to a better quality of living and save lives. The TRAUMA program is a testimonial to the benefits of helping those who protect our communities on a 24/7 basis.

Due to the ongoing need for this type of training and based on the remarks from those who completed the course, TRAUMA has been highly regarded and is expected to continue. Comments have included:

"This was, by far, one of the best training seminars I have attended in the last 15 years. There was a lot of good in-

Executive Exchange

formation given about Line of Duty Death, preparation/ notification.”

“The presenters were outstanding, bringing real life experience to the table. Truly amazing...From the heart and really hits home with all the LEO’s.”

“Great course, couldn’t be more impressed. Very organized and full of energy from start to finish. Will look to host at our agency.”

If additional information about this program is desired, readers are encouraged to contact the members of the TRAUMA training team directly:

Scott Neff:	scott.neff@dcjs.ny.gov
Tim Whitcomb:	tswitcomb@cattco.org
Bonita Frazer:	bonitafrazer@yahoo.com
Dave Nowakowski:	dnowakow@twcny.rr.com
Jim Banish:	james.banish@sheriff.co.warren.ny.us
Karen Howard:	khoward368@roadrunner.com
Jeannette Shields:	cshields56@roadrunner.com
Robert Douglas:	redoug2001@aol.com

“Law enforcement officers are never ‘off duty.’ They are dedicated public servants who are sworn to protect public safety at any time and place that the peace is threatened. They need all the help that they can get.”

- Barbara Boxer

Scott Neff is Associate Training Technician with the New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services; **Tim Whitcomb** is Sheriff of Cattaraugus County, New York;

Bonita Frazer is a Clinician with the Western New York (WYN) Police Helpline; **Dave Nowakowski** is a retired Investigator from the Oneida County Sheriff’s Department; **Jim Banish** is a Patrol Officer with the Warren County Sheriff’s Office; **Karen Howard** is with the New York State Police Employee Assistance Program; **Jeannette Shields** is part of the TRAUMA training team; and **Robert Douglas**, a retired Baltimore Police Officer, is Founder and Executive Director of the National Police Suicide Foundation, Inc.

While the focus of this article is on law enforcement personnel, the subject matter is just as relevant to probation and parole officers.

THE MOTIVATION MYSTERY

by

Randy Garner, Ph.D.

Much has been written on the topic of motivation, yet this process often remains elusive for many in leadership roles. Many historic thinkers and scientists including Aristotle, Freud, Maslow, and others have struggled to try and understand what motivates us as human beings. The term itself is of French origin and means “to stimulate toward action” or “a moving force.” In fact, the root word in motivation is “motive” – which is a reason to act. When we are trying to motivate someone we are attempting to give them a reason to move in a particular direction or accomplish a specific task. In leadership terms motivation is associated with the desire of a person to engage in some activity. The real challenge is that what may be motivating for one person may not be for another. As individuals, we are not all motivated by the same things and we are not all motivated in the same way. There is a near infinite number of internal and external factors that can impact one’s motivation. In fact, what is considered to be motivating can be impacted by other individuals, by the culture, by history, and it can change dramatically over time.

Part of the complexity occurs because individuals can differ profoundly in their personality, abilities, self-concept, perceptions, and attitudes. Each of these factors can have an impact on how an individual views a situation and what they consider motivating. One individual may be pleased and motivated to have the opportunity to work overtime as it meets a financial need; another may have a strong desire to be with their family and consider overtime to be a punishment. Same opportunity; different assessment by different individuals.

Motivation is a dynamic, goal oriented process that is often based on how individuals assess the motivating factor and can be based on their own feelings and in relation to their own particular needs. This is why there is no one-size-fits-all ability to motivate and why some attempts to motivate others will often fail. It is important to assess the situation, the individual, and their needs when trying to identify a motivating influence. As leaders, we must do our best to know our people; their strengths and weaknesses, their personal goals and ambitions, and what they may find individually motivating.

One area that can be particularly confounding is when individual leaders confuse motivation with ability. First, motivation is not cheerleading, it is much more. It is based on the individual’s needs and capabilities. It can be quite frustrating, the opposite of motivating, to be asked to do something for which one has no ability or facility to accomplish. If one does not know how to do calculus, no amount of cheerleading or encouragement or expressions of faith in the individual will change that. No amount of attempts at motivation will overcome one’s lack of ability. Trying to do so reminds me of the Mark Twain’s comment “Never try to teach a pig to sing. It wastes your time and annoys the pig.” Yet, some leaders will persist in engaging their view of motivation without fully considering the commensurate abilities of their intended target.

In a similar vein we must be leery of the management equivalent of the “could you do it if I put a gun to your head” test. If the task was impossible then it clearly is an ability issue. How-

ever, if it is not impossible, but undesirable, one might be able to crank up the short-term pressure to gain compliance, but that is neither positively motivating nor effective in the long term. In fact, this brings up one of the most important considerations in effective motivation that is often overlooked. Many believe that motivation is all about adding something to the picture; some reward, encouragement, or incentive. However, one of the neglected “secrets” related to motivation is not about adding to, but rather subtracting from or removing some of the factors that would otherwise make the task, the job, or the situation undesirable.

If a task is undesirable, consider ways to remove or reduce some of the factors that are less appealing. Perhaps individuals could deal with the activity for a shorter amount of time or the task could be divided in such a way that they only deal with a portion of the activity, rather than having to address it wholly. This approach can vary in as many ways as the tasks with which they are associated. The point is to make the situation less negative. If you do not at least consider this approach, then you will likely be constantly looking for ways to motivate people to do something they hate. Good luck with that.

In surveys of successful managers and leaders there is a recognition of the individualized nature involved in the concept of motivation. One survey found that when leaders displayed “mutual respect” and “personal involvement/appreciation” motivating individuals to accomplish tasks was more effective. When workers feel good about what they do, feel good about themselves, and have a positive regard for their leaders and the agency they work for, cooperation occurs much more easily.

Some have indicated that an employee or individual “just isn’t motivated” or “they are not able to be motivated.” However, nothing could be further from the truth. Motivation is a psychological and social process. It is brain-driven behavior. In fact, people are always motivated; people choose their behavior. This occurs even when their actions may not make any sense to others. Individuals have a way of creating contingencies and pay-off matrices that can seemingly defy reason. The problem for leaders is not that individuals are not motive, it is that individuals may not be motivated to do what the leader wants them to accomplish. Some may be motivated to be lazy or unproductive because there is a perception of a payoff for them – even if it ultimately gets them fired. The human mind can be a mysterious place.

Motivational Myths

There are several common myths that relate to motivating employees. Though not always applicable to all situations, these bear consideration:

Myth 1: “I can motivate people.” Not really. People ultimately have to motivate themselves. However, you can set up an environment where they can motivate and empower themselves. The key is understanding that each individual is unique and views the world differently.

Myth 2: “Money is a good motivator.” Again, not really. This can sometimes help individuals from becoming less motivated,

but usually money does not help people become more motivated. No one is going to go “die in the ditch” for you just because they got a dollar an hour raise. Ultimately, any temporary boost that may occur with a raise dwindles rather rapidly and the individual comes to view this as a deserved compensation, not something to consider motivating.

Myth 3: “Fear is a darn good motivator.” Well . . . fear can be a great motivator – for a very short time. The problem is that this has little lasting effect and introduces negative attributes of its own. Additionally, if a leader is focused on using fear as their primary motivational tool . . . they need a much better toolbox. This speaks volumes about the capability of the leader.

Myth 4: “I know what motivates me so I know what motivates my employees.” Different people are motivated by different things and in different ways. In fact, the American Management Association indicates that a poor recognition of this key concept can result in a leader’s derailment and quick exit. The emphasis must be on understanding what motivates each of your employees.

Myth 5: “Increased job satisfaction means increased job performance.” Though this sounds right, the research suggests it is not necessarily true. In fact, some may be satisfied with their job because there is no accountability in place and they are not held to any standard or requirement. They may be very happy to do little; however, this is not increasing the organizational performance level.

This final myth addresses a larger issue of motivation. There are generally three broad categories of motivation. There is extrinsic motivation in which individuals are motivated by outside influences. This can be reward, recognition, money, fame, notoriety, and so forth. Intrinsic motivation occurs when individuals find the work or task to be self-satisfying, perhaps meeting a personal desire or need that allows them to feel more fulfilled in some way. Finally there is self-motivation in which the person assesses the situation or environment in such a way that they come to their own conclusion that the task, event, or circumstance is worthy of their efforts. Ultimately, motivation likely contains degrees of all of these elements; however, the best motivation is likely derived from the self-motivational assessment of an individual. There is nothing more convincing than when one convinces oneself.

For the manager or leader, recognizing the complexities and individual assessments that are involved in the process of moti-

vation can be very helpful. Understanding the psychosocial nature of motivation allows a leader to better focus on that which will be more productive when accomplishing their leadership role. The true goal for any leader to be successful when attempting to motivate others is to realize that they must endeavor to set the environment to elicit more self-motivation in their employees whenever possible and then consistently work to reinforce it.

References

- Conger, J. A., and Riggio, R. E. (2006). *The Practice of Leadership*. Wiley & Sons.
- Garner, R. (2009). “The Leadership Paradox,” *SWJLE*, 10(2).
- Hughes, Ginnett, and Curphy (2015). *Leadership: Enhancing the Lessons of Experience*. McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- Nohria, N., Groysberg, B., and Lee, L. (2008). *Employee Motivation: A Powerful New Model*. <https://hbr.org/2008/07/employee-motivation-a-powerful-new-model>.
- Northouse, P. (2015). *Leadership: Concepts and Practices*. Sage.

Randy Garner, who holds two doctorates, is a Professor of Behavioral Sciences and former Associate Dean in the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University (SHSU). Dr. Garner also served as founding Director of the Texas Regional Community Policing Institute and as Executive Director of the Law Enforcement Management Institute of Texas. Prior to coming to SHSU, Dr. Garner was the Associate Director of Behavioral Medicine at the University of Houston. Before entering academia, Dr. Garner served in all divisions and levels of command, including as a Police Chief, in his 30 year career in law enforcement. Dr. Garner has authored numerous books and professional publications with particular emphasis in the areas of social influence, persuasion, and leadership. In addition, Dr. Garner is the Editor-in-Chief of *Applied Psychology in Criminal Justice*, an interdisciplinary, peer-reviewed, academic journal that examines the social and psychological aspects of human behavior as related to applied societal and criminal justice settings. This is Dr. Garner’s second contribution regarding leadership issues in *Executive Exchange*.

FROM THE BOOKSHELF

Executive Exchange welcomes reviews of books and periodicals dealing with community corrections, the criminal justice system, research and evaluations of correctional programs, and management and leadership issues. The reviews found in this issue have been contributed by: Jessica Spape, Case Manager at Crossroads Day Reporting Centre of St. Leonard's Society Toronto and an Instructor at Humber College in Toronto, Ontario; Donald G. Evans, a past President of the American Probation and Parole Association and Contributing Editor to *Executive Exchange*; and Dan Richard Beto, a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives and Editor of *Executive Exchange*.

MONITORING DYNAMIC RISK FACTORS IN FEMALE OFFENDERS

Review of "Using Dynamic Factors to Predict Recidivism Among Women: A Four-Wave Prospective Study" by Leigh E. Greiner, Moira, A. Law, and Shelley L. Brown, appearing in *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 42, No. 5, 2015.

Female offenders represent a growing population in the correctional landscape and, as such, there has been increased research interest in this group to help inform best practice guidelines. Greiner, Law, and Brown's illuminating report on dynamic risk factors is one whose findings may seem intuitive to individuals who work with female offenders post incarceration. The authors followed 497 Canadian women who had been released in the community and assessed them four times at 6-month intervals using the Community Intervention Scale. The researchers found that, aside from substance abuse, all dynamic risk factors (which include employment, marital/family, community functioning, personal/emotional, criminal associates, and criminal attitudes) changed over time for their sample (in this case need was reduced). They further found that employment and associates were the best predictors of recidivism in their sample.

For individuals who help assist female offenders reintegrate into society post-incarceration these findings validate our focus on securing work and housing for these women. Though the Community Intervention Scale used by the researchers does not assess housing directly, housing needs are often directly connected to employment needs. For example, one cannot secure housing without an income and, conversely, it is often difficult to secure a job without an address. This means that the funding cuts made to transitional and low-cost housing options, as well as to organizations whose mission is to help recently released women reintegrate into society directly effects public safety and reduces the likelihood of successful reintegration. It is important to note that securing employment and safe housing is also often connected to ensuring individuals do not feel the need to re-initiate contact with their criminal associates. For example, for an individual who dealt drugs in the community, having a steady income helps alleviate the desire to contact their supplier and return to their previous lifestyle to make quick money in order to support basic needs. Another way income and increased housing options may help address the issue of criminal associates is by increasing the likelihood that the individual could move to a new area which may assist them in their capacity to cease contact with associates.

Another important finding from the study is that all the dynamic risk factors included in the study significantly decreased over time for woman who did not reoffend except for substance abuse. This finding makes intuitive sense as one would expect that when risk factors associated with recidivism decrease the

likelihood for successful reintegration would increase. It is nice when research validates what front-line workers commonly see with their clients.

The authors insightfully comment that due to the nature of the study they are unable to comment about the efficacy of the programs completed by the women in their sample despite their findings. This study highlights the need for practitioners within the criminal justice field to conduct program evaluations to help better understand which programs and services are working in our quest to reduce recidivism and increase public safety. This line of research could assist programs by providing concrete evidence to show potential funders as well as increase our knowledge of best practice guidelines for this increasing correctional population.

To access a summary of the article that prompted this review, visit: <http://cjb.sagepub.com/content/42/5/457.full.pdf>.

Jessica Spape

EXPERIENCES OF GANG MEMBERS

Review of *Gang Life: 10 of the Toughest Tell Their Stories* by Mark Totten. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company, 2014. 210 pages.

Both academic and journalistic interest in gangs is a constant staple of the publishing industry during the past decade, whether of organized crime gangs or street gangs. There are a number of academic studies that have focused on the organizational and territorial aspects of gangs in urban areas. And more recently there are a number of investigative journalistic books exploring this subject as well as television documentaries. Readers who are interested in two such academic efforts should take a look at Sudhur Venkatesh's *Gang Leader for a Day* and Alice Goffman's *On the Run: Fugitive Life in an American City*. Of recent interest however, is the desire to understand the lives of gang members or participants and to design exit strategies for those wishing to leave gang life. Also there is a renewed effort to understand the process of desisting from criminal activity that has focused attention on the stories and narratives of participants in gang life.

Mark Totten, a professor of criminal justice at Humber College in Toronto, Ontario, and who has been a front-line social worker for 25 years, has produced an interesting contribution to the search for understanding of gang members based on his experiences and academic interests. His previous book *Nasty, Brutish and Short: The Lives of Gang Members in Canada*, led to this further exploration of gang life. His recent book is a further exploration of gangs in Canada but with a unique approach that involved in-depth interviews with a number of members of various street gang and their experiences in several different communities spread across Canada. The author wanted to understand gang members' use of violence and involvement in criminal activity from their point of view and in the process trace

their lives from infancy to adulthood. The methodology used was to get consent from participants to take part in confidential, audio taped in-depth interviews and to use several interview techniques such as structured questionnaires and open-ended questions. He also promised to protect the identity of the individual participants, thus in this book the actual names of the gang members whose life stories are recorded have had their names changed as well as any other easily identifiable locations. The ten stories narrated in this book have the participants' permission for the author to tell their story in the structured form that forms the basis of the book. Totten makes it clear that not all gang affiliated individuals are open to telling their life stories and notes that:

You can't just sit down and record conversations with people you don't know, let alone hardened gangsters. It takes considerable time to build trust and establish a level of comfort. I spent many months getting to know my informants prior to turning my recorder on. They in turn, put considerable thought into whether, and under what conditions, they might want to open up their lives to me.

So who are the participants whose stories are told in this book? The stories are of seven men and three women, all who acknowledge that they are now ex-gang members who have been out of gang life for anywhere from one to five years. Their ages range from 25 to 41 years and seven of them were born in Canada and three immigrated to Canada as children whose families were fleeing conflict and strife in their homelands. All of them are consider either substance users or abusers. The ten participants played a variety of roles in the gangs they were affiliated with and represented three basic types of gang structure: highly organized, chaotic street gangs, and a multinational organized crime group. In terms of personal experiences, the subjects of this study had witnessed or participated in violent crimes, half of them had attempted suicide, and all had experienced a traumatic childhood. However, their socio-economic backgrounds varied and as the stories are told a picture of their uniqueness emerges. From these narratives the author provides the reader with an opportunity to understand how these individuals become involved with gang life. The stories tend to reveal the early childhood and adolescent difficulties faced by these former gang members. Most of the stories reveal events and circumstances that should have been responded to by child welfare and youth protective services and point to the need for better early intervention programs if we are to reduce the violent and wasteful lives that are the product of our neglect.

Totten, in his concluding chapter notes: "Spending too much time in the child welfare and youth justice systems, particularly when exposed to anti-social peers, can lead to gang involvement and entrenchment in criminal life." He tells us that when he talks to gang and ex-gang members they inform him that they joined gangs after being exposed to them in secure custody facilities, group homes, and foster home. The reason, I believe, for telling these stories is not to excuse their behavior but to understand what interventions we could adopt to prevent youth from entering a pathway to crime and to find ways to assist those who wish to pursue a pathway of desistance from crime. Giving offenders, whether gang members or not, a voice serves to assist us in being more nuanced about the individuals' lives and what might be of use in working with them to change their current pathway to a more pro-social ones. These stories provide us with details that

help us understand the complexities of their lives. It is possible that one outcome from this process of telling their stories can be the construction of a new identity that will aid them on the road to desisting from crime.

Why should practitioners read this book and similar ones? I would suggest that we read then for the same reason we might read biographies, namely so that we can get a deeper understanding of character and the forces that impinge on character development. The author has given us a starting point for a greater understanding of what it means to be a gang member in Canada and what it takes to exit gang life.

Donald G. Evans

A SCHOLARLY JOURNEY

Review of *An Eye for an Eye: A Global History of Crime and Punishment*, by Mitchel P. Roth. London: Reaktion Books, 2014. 342 pages.

Over the years we have had an opportunity to read and enjoy a number of books dealing with the history of various aspects of criminal justice. A few immediately coming to mind – primarily because they remain in our library – include: *Criminal Justice Through the Ages: From Divine Judgment to Modern German Legislation*, edited by Christoph Hinckeldey and translated by John Fosberry; Cesare Beccaria's *On Crimes and Punishments*; *State Prison Life by One Who Has Been There*, by J. H. Banka; *The Oxford History of the Prison: The Practice of Punishment in Western Society*, edited by Norval Morris and David J. Rothman; *The Fatal Shore*, by Robert Hughes; Lawrence M. Friedman's *Crime and Punishment in American History*; *Forms of Constraint: A History of Prison Architecture*, by Norman Johnson; *Maconochie's Gentlemen: The Story of Norfolk Island and the Roots of Modern Prison Reform*, by Norval Morris; and Joel F. Harrington's *The Faithful Executioner: Life and Death, Honor and Shame in the Turbulent Sixteenth Century*.

We now have a new book joining this collection – *An Eye for an Eye: A Global History of Crime and Punishment* by Mitchel P. Roth, Professor of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas. In his latest book, Roth provides a scholarly and, at times, graphic examination of criminal justice practices through the ages.

Roth, trained as a historian at the University of California-Santa Barbara, where he earned a master's degree and a doctorate, is the author of a number of books, including: *Houston Blue: The History of the Houston Police Department* with Tom Kennedy; *A History of Crime and Punishment: Readings and Documents in Criminal Justice*; *Encyclopedia of War Journalism, 1807-2010*; *Global Organized Crime: A Reference Handbook*; *Crime and Punishment: A History of the Criminal Justice System*; *Organized Crime; Prisons and Prison Systems: A Global Encyclopedia*; *Issues in Westward Expansion*; *Courtesy, Service, and Protection: The History of the Texas Department of Public Safety*; *Historical Dictionary of Law Enforcement*; *Reading the American West: Primary Source Readings in American History*; and *Fulfilling a Mandate: A History of the Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University*.

In the introduction to his latest published book, Roth gives an insightful perspective on the book's scope and on the history of criminal justice, where he writes:

A global history of crime and punishment reveals that despite amazing advances on every level of the human experience, there is a remarkable continuity in what crimes are committed as well as the sanctions used to punish them. Although the means for committing crimes are quite different in the digital post-industrial world, the goals and motivations of criminals and criminal justice systems have not strayed too far from their antecedents. Ultimately, *An Eye for an Eye* demonstrates that the history of crime and punishment remains an inconsistent chronicle of experimentation – borrowing, adapting and finding new alternatives – often finding penal officials going back to history books to retool ancient sanctions for a new world. Although empirical evidence regarding their success is meager if not suspect, the past decades have seen the return of shaming, chain gangs and exhibitory punishment, sanctions once thought relics of a penal past.

Through nine chapters this book provides the reader with the development of criminal justice – from prehistoric to modern times. In the first chapter the author examines some of the early cultures and customs that existed prior to the written law. Also presented in this chapter are some of the legal foundations that influenced present practices and procedures. Chapter 2 – “The Rise of Legal Traditions” – focuses on the legal traditions of the following societies: Roman, English, Islamic, and Chinese and Mongolian. In the third chapter Roth shows how crime and punishment changed as societies developed from feudal society to the more formal city and state. To illustrate the change, the author examines changes during the Middle Ages in Western Europe, Japan, China, Italy, and Russia.

Chapter 4, which deals with the transformation of punishment and the rise of the penitentiary, is one of the more inter-

esting chapters in the book. Specific sections in this chapter include: “English Crime and Punishment,” “Early Financial Crime,” “Execution as Public Spectacle,” “Precursors to the Penitentiary: Penal Colonies, Transportation and Servitude,” “Workhouses, Houses of Correction and Bridewells,” “American Penal Progress in the New Republic,” “The Russian Enigma,” and “The Qing Dynasty.” In the fifth chapter Roth examines the development of organized crime, beginning with early bands of thieves and outlaws, and the response by societies to suppress this form of criminality. The next chapter builds on the theme of organized crime and takes it into the international arena.

The seventh chapter is devoted to a specific crime – murder – with a focus on multiple murders and related crimes. In Chapter 8 – “Crime and Punishment in a Post-colonial World” – the author provides a discussion of the role of colonialism in expanding modern legal systems and penal sanctions throughout the world. The final chapter provides a summary of the book and takes the reader into the 21st century with the challenges of global and high-tech crime and demands by societies for a better approach to crime and punishment.

While *An Eye for an Eye* has its limitations – which the author readily acknowledges – it presents, nonetheless, a valuable overview of crime and punishment throughout history and across many cultures, all in less than 350 pages. Roth may be pardonably proud of this research and literary effort, which should prove of interest to criminal justice practitioners, academicians, and historians.

Dan Richard Beto

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

VARELA NAMED PRESIDENT OF CHIEF PROBATION OFFICERS OF CALIFORNIA

In April 2015 Ventura County Chief Probation Officer **Mark Varela** was named President of the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC). The 55-year-old organization is based in Sacramento and Varela is the second member from Ventura County to serve as its President. Previously he served as the CPOC Legislative Chair, Secretary, and Vice President.

Varela, a Ventura County native, received a bachelor's degree from the University of California at Santa Barbara. More than two decades ago he started with the Ventura County Probation Department as a deputy probation officer and rose through the ranks, becoming Chief Probation Officer in 2010.

"Our job at Probation is to keep the community safe by balancing the sanctions we apply to the offenders in our care against the needs of the victim and the community," said Varela. "We believe we can bring positive changes to lives of the youth and adult offenders under our jurisdiction by accurately assessing their risk to the community and the extent of intervention necessary. This approach is currently being done successfully by many probation departments across the state through CPOC."

"The CPOC goals fit very well with our goals for probation in Ventura County," said Varela. "Our vision here is guided by the belief that our decisions and actions today determine the quality of our lives tomorrow. Everything we do, we do to make the future better for those in our custody, their families, crime victims, and the community."

Varela oversees nearly 450 deputy probation officers, corrections services officers and specialized support personnel. They are responsible for the supervision of more than 15,000 adults and juveniles on probation, the supervision of adults and youth in custodial facilities, direct investigative report services to the Ventura County Superior Court and the delivery of specialized services to hundreds of people participating in other programs.

During his 26-year career, Varela has had a major leadership role in the design, development and oversight of many innovative and successful delinquency programs in Ventura County. He also played a key role in the Juvenile Justice Center's construction oversight and policy development team, and he was instrumental in establishing California's first Boys and Girls Club inside a juvenile detention center. Varela also received an award as the Camarillo's *Public Servant of the Year* in 2010 and the *Courageous Leadership Award* in 2013 from the W. Haywood Burns Institute for Juvenile Justice Fairness and Equity for his work in implementing strategies and interventions that contributed to a significant reduction in admissions at the Juvenile Facilities for youth of color, particularly Latino youth.

NEW CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER IN BRAZOS COUNTY, TEXAS

On April 30, 2015, the District and County Court-at-Law Judges of Brazos County unanimously named **Jennifer Goerig** as the new Director of the Brazos County Community Su-

pervision and Corrections Department in Bryan, Texas, effective June 1, 2015.

Goerig began her career with the department while studying at Texas A&M University. She graduated with a bachelor's degree in psychology in 1994 and continued with the department full time. She furthered her education while working, earning a master's degree in criminal justice management from Sam Houston State University in 2011.

During her more than two decade tenure with the department, Goerig has held a variety of positions; most recently she served as a Senior Community Supervision Officer and Court Liaison Officer.

In addition to her duties with the department, Goerig serves as a Resource Training Officer for the Texas Probation Training Academy, a program of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University. As a Resource Training Officer, Goerig is responsible for training probation officers from across the Lone Star State. In 2006 she was named *Resource Training Officer of the Year*.

In 2002 Goerig was the recipient of the *Judge Terry L. Jacks Award* from the Texas Probation Association, presented to adult probation officers for significant contributions to the probation profession.

Steve Smith, Judge of the 361st Judicial District, said a combination of Goerig's qualities – including her leadership skills and wealth of experience – played a role in their decision. During April 2015 the Judges interviewed 11 applicants locally and from across the state for the position.

Goerig replaces **Lynne Rivas**, a former Deputy Director of the department who has served as Interim Director since February; Rivas, who had retired and who was brought back to the department to assist during the search process, was not interested in the position.

Goerig said her goal is for the department to continue to "serve the courts and the community and working with offenders to help them in making changes that are going to ultimately affect their life." She continued: "I'm honored and grateful for the opportunity to lead this amazing department. It's been like a home to me for over 20 years, and I truly believe in what we do. I'm really excited about the future."

On June 5, 2015, a reception was held for Goerig following the administration of the oath of office.

CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR APPOINTS BROWN TO JUVENILE JUSTICE COMMITTEE

In May 2015 California Governor **Edmund G. "Jerry" Brown, Jr.**, appointed **Michelle Scray Brown** of Hesperia to the State Advisory Committee on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. Brown has served as Chief Probation Officer of the San Bernardino County Probation Department since 2009, where she has held several positions of increasing responsibility since 1985. She earned a master's degree in criminal justice from California State University, San Bernardino.

LONGTIME UPSHUR COUNTY, TEXAS, PROBATION DIRECTOR RETIRES

According to an article appearing in the *Gilmer Mirror*, **Darrell Ray**, Upshur County's Chief Probation Officer, retired at the end of May 2015 after 28 years of service in Upshur and Marion counties.

Ray began his community corrections career in Upshur and Marion counties as a probation officer in May of 1987. After ten years of service as a probation officer, Ray was appointed Chief by 115th District Judge **Lauren Parish**. As part of his job, Ray supervised the probation departments in both counties.

A native of Brownwood and the son of longtime Upshur County Justice of the Peace **W.V. Ray**, he graduated in 1975 from Dallas Baptist College with a degree in education. He taught at Giddings State School before moving to Upshur County to begin his career in community corrections.

"I have had a great boss and a great staff for all these years," Ray said. "I will deeply miss seeing my office family. I am grateful to the folks of Upshur and Marion Counties for the opportunity and honor of being able to serve in this capacity and do the work that I have loved so much for so many years."

COLLEGE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE CELEBRATES GOLDEN ANNIVERSARY AND PHILLIP LYONS NAMED DEAN

In late April 2015 the criminal justice program at Sam Houston State University – formerly the Institute of Contemporary Corrections and Behavioral Sciences and now known as the College of Criminal Justice and housed in the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center – celebrated its golden anniversary. Activities included: the Leadership Luncheon, during which recently retired Professor **Jerry L. Dowling** was presented with the *Defensor Pacem Award*; the Honors Convocation, in which scholarship recipients were recognized; a series of presentations, including the Beto Chair Lecture; a reception, followed by the 50th Anniversary Gala. It was a joyous time in which the founders and the program's many accomplishments were recalled.

Then in early May more joyous news about the program was formally announced by **Jaimie Hebert**, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs at Sam Houston State University – **Phillip M. Lyons** was named the new Dean of the College of Criminal Justice and Director of the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center. Dr. Lyons had been serving as Interim Dean for the past year while a nationwide search was conducted.

Dr. Lyons joined the faculty of the College of Criminal Justice in 1995. During his tenure with the College, he became a full professor and served as Executive Director of the Texas Regional Center for Policing Innovation, Director of the Division of Professional Justice Studies, and Chair of the Department of Security Studies.

A scholar and a former law enforcement officer, Dr. Lyons earned a bachelor's degree from the University of Houston–Clear Lake, and a master's degree, law degree, and Ph. D. degree in forensic clinical psychology from the University of Nebraska. He is widely published in academic and practitioner journals and is frequently called upon as a presenter at conferences, seminars, and training programs.

"The founders of this prestigious program – **George J. Beto, David W. Crews, Arleigh B. Templeton, and George G. Killinger**, all of whom have joined the majority – would be pleased with this selection," said **Dan Richard Beto**, the retired founding Executive Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas. "Phillip will provide the visionary leadership this program needs."

The Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University serves as the secretariat for the National Association of Probation Executives.

NEW DIRECTOR NAMED FOR THE CONCHO VALLEY COMMUNITY SUPERVISION AND CORRECTIONS DEPARTMENT

On June 5, 2015, **Jed Davenport**, Director of the Midland County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Midland, Texas, was named Director of the Concho Valley Community Supervision and Corrections Department, headquartered in San Angelo, Texas. The jurisdiction of the department includes seven counties: Coke, Concho, Irion, Runnels, Schleicher, Sterling, and Tom Green. Davenport replaces **John Wilmoth**, who retired after a long and distinguished career in Texas community corrections.

NAPE MEMBERS PARTICIPATE IN INTERNATIONAL PROBATION SEMINAR

For the fourth time in as many years, members of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE) were invited by **Piotr Bureczyk**, Director of the Probation Officer Academy of Poland (CSKS), a division of Business Communication Group (BCG), to participate in an international probation seminar in Poland in May 2015. Members of the delegation included: **Dan Richard Beto**, Chair of NAPE's International Committee and Editor of *Executive Exchange*; **Bernard Fitzgerald**, the retired Chief Probation Officer for Dorchester, Massachusetts, and a member of the International Committee; and **Jurg Gerber**, Professor and Chair of the Department of Security Studies in the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University. Previous seminars have been held in Bytów, Toruń, and Wrocław; this year's seminar dealt with the issue of offender reentry and took place in Gniezno.

The seminar began with a welcome by **Tomasz Budasz**, the President (Mayor) of Gniezno, who had considerable interest in social issues and working with disadvantaged populations. After the Mayor's remarks, Bureczyk provided an overview of the focus of the seminar – issues in reentry – and then Beto spoke about a proposed program for a Polish delegation invited to come to Texas in October; this invitation was issued by the Correctional Management Institute of Texas, the National Association of Probation Executives, and the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University.

Bureczyk then spoke about reentry practices in Poland and Beto followed with his presentation – "Closing the Front Door to the Offender Reentry Problem." Gerber then presented his paper – "Reintegrating Offenders into Society vs. Excluding Offenders from Society: How to Reduce Recidivism Rates." Fitzgerald spoke next, and his paper was entitled "Reentry and the Tools for Redemption." It was interesting that while all three Americans

prepared their papers independently of one other, each had similar themes and emphasis points.

After lunch seminar participants heard a presentation from **Magdalena Miewiadowska-Kraczyk**, an Associate Professor at the University of Łódź, who spoke on legal issues related to reentry. She was followed by Senior Probation Specialist **Małgorzata Cherezińska** with the Court in Pabianice, who provided a thoughtful presentation on her work with offenders.

During the seminar participants had a wide ranging discussion about differences and similarities between the Polish and American criminal justice systems. This seminar was conducted in both Polish and English; **Paulina Dzwonnik**, a professional translator/interpreter, did a commendable job of facilitating communication.

The fifth annual conference is scheduled for early June 2016 in Kazimierz Dolny, Poland.

Elsewhere in this issue of *Executive Exchange* are several of the papers presented at the seminar in Gniezno.

NEW ISSUE OF EUROVISTA NOW AVAILABLE

The latest issue (Vol. 3, No. 3) of *EuroVista: Probation and Community Justice* is now available online. First published in January 2010, *EuroVista* is a tri-annual journal on probation matters in Europe. *EuroVista*, a publication of CEP, the Confederation of Probation in Europe, aims to provide readers with an accessible, scholarly, and relevant source of information on probation research and practice development for both academics and practitioners.

Of particular interest in this issue is an article about mental health treatment of probationers by **Todd Jermstad**, Director of the Bell-Lampasas Counties Community Supervision and Corrections Department, headquartered in Belton, Texas; he is also a member of the NAPE Board of Directors and the International Committee. This article may be read at: <http://euro-vista.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/What-Probation-in-the-United-States-Can-Learn-from-Emerging-Practices-in-Mental-Health-Treatment.pdf>.

To access the entire issue, go to: <http://euro-vista.org/euro-vistavol3-3/>.

DIRECTOR OF CALCASIEU PARISH JUVENILE JUSTICE SERVICES RECEIVES STATE AWARD

William Sommers, Director of the Calcasieu Parish Office of Juvenile Justice Services (OJJS) in Louisiana was awarded the prestigious *Don E. Wydra Memorial Award* for making an extraordinary contribution to juvenile justice and delinquency prevention. The high standards of this award focus on the commitment of the recipient towards bettering juvenile justice as a whole and being an advocate for juveniles who often have none.

Sommers was presented this award on May 6, 2015, at the 35th Governor's Conference on Juvenile Justice held in New Orleans. His work with OJJS at the Police Jury reflects Sommers significant impact on juvenile justice as a role model, with unselfish support of workers and volunteers and exceptional work ethic in many years of service.

Assistant Administrator **Dane Bolin** was pleased to see the award go to Sommers. "I was excited to see that Bill received the

Don E. Wydra Memorial Award. Bill has been an outstanding champion for juvenile justice not only in Calcasieu Parish but on a state and federal level. Bill has made a tremendous impact on the families of Calcasieu Parish for many years and this award is well earned and deserved."

Sommers is the local coordinator of the Annie E. Casey Foundation's Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) and chairman of the Calcasieu Parish Children and Youth Planning Board. He is a certified Juvenile Court Administrator through the National Juvenile and Family Court Judge's Association and a member of the National Association of Probation Executives. The award honors years of tireless service which began as a Juvenile Probation Officer for OJJS in 1987 and continued to provide services as a Director of Probation and then Assistant Director to the department until recently promoted to the Director of OJJS in March of 2014.

The *Don E. Wydra Memorial Award* was created by members of the Governor's Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Advisory Board in memory of **Don E. Wydra**, who served as Chief of the Department of Public Safety and Corrections' Juvenile Services Section under three governors – **Edwin Edwards**, **Dave Treen** and **Buddy Roemer**.

VIRGINIA GOVERNOR APPOINTS PAROLE COMMISSION

On July 9, 2015, Virginia Governor **Terry McAuliffe** announced the appointment of an experienced group of law enforcement professionals, legislators, community leaders, and academics to serve on his Commission on Parole Review. On June 24, 2015, the Governor signed Executive Order No. 44 creating the Commission and charging it with reviewing Virginia's approach to parole and recommending any policy changes that may enhance public safety while protecting taxpayer dollars. The Commission will be chaired by former Virginia Attorney General **Mark Earley**, with Secretary of Public Safety and Homeland Security **Brian Moran** and Secretary of the Commonwealth **Levar Stoney** serving as Co-Chairs.

"This bipartisan panel of Virginia leaders will bring an array of perspectives to this important discussion about how our Commonwealth can best keep our communities safe while spending every taxpayer dollar as wisely as possible," said Governor McAuliffe. "I applaud their willingness to put political dogma and preconceived notions aside and engage in a thoughtful process about how this policy has worked for Virginians over the past twenty years and whether there are any opportunities to improve it going forward. With the guidance of Co-Chairs Moran, Stoney and Earley, I am confident that their final report will represent the best interests of all citizens of the Commonwealth."

The Commission will address five significant priorities related to parole reform:

1. Conduct a review of previous goals and subsequent outcomes;
2. Examine the cost of parole reform/abolition;
3. Evaluate the best practices of other states;
4. Recommend other mediation strategies; and
5. Provide recommendations to address public safety challenges.

A draft report is due to the Governor by November 2, 2015, with a final report due December 4, 2015.

In addition to Earley, Moran, and Stoney, members of this commission include: **Jill Vogel** of Fauquier, Member, Senate of Virginia; **Dave Marsden** of Burke, Member, Senate of Virginia; **Dave Albo** of Fairfax, Member, Virginia House of Delegates, and Chairman, Courts of Justice Committee; **Luke E. Torian** of Prince William, Member, Virginia House of Delegates; **Kenneth W. Stolle** of Virginia Beach, Sheriff, Virginia Beach Sheriff's Office; **La Bravia J. Jenkins** of the City of Fredericksburg, Commonwealth's Attorney; **Gail Arnall** of Washington, D.C., consultant for outreach and development, Offender Aid and Restoration; **Camille Cooper** of Louisa, Director of Government Affairs, The National Association to Protect Children; **Marcus M. Hodges** of Spotsylvania, President, National Association of Probation Executives; **Cynthia E. Hudson** of Richmond, Chief Deputy Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General; **Kimberly Lettner** of Farmville, Retired Chief of Capitol Police; **William R. Richardson, Jr.**, of Arlington, Member, Virginia CURE, and retired partner of Wilmer, Cutler, Pickering, Hale and Dorr LLP; **Cheryl Robinette** of Buchanan, Director of Substance Abuse Services, Cumberland Mountain Community Services Board; **Mira Signer** of Richmond, Executive Director, National Alliance on Mental Illness of Virginia; **Faye S. Taxman** of Gaithersburg, Maryland, Professor, George Mason University; **David R. Lett** of Richmond, Public Defender, Petersburg Public Defender's Office; **Meredith Farrar-Owens** of Henrico, Director, Virginia Criminal Sentencing Commission; **Sandra M. Brandt** of Norfolk, Executive Director, STEP-UP Inc.; **Alvin Edwards** of Charlottesville, Pastor, Mt. Zion First African Baptist Church; **Jack Gravely** of Richmond, Executive Director, Virginia State NAACP; **Bobby N. Vassar** of Richmond, Chief Counsel (Retired), U.S. House Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime; **Timothy J. Heaphy** of Charlottesville, Partner, Hunton and Williams, and former United States Attorney for the Western District of Virginia; **Mindy M. Stell** of Dinwiddie, President, Virginia Victim Assistance Network; and **Thomas M. Wolf** of Richmond, Partner, LeClairRyan.

Ex-officio members include: **Tonya Chapman** of Richmond, Deputy Secretary of Public Safety and Homeland Security; **Karen Brown** of Richmond, Chair, Virginia Parole Board; **Harold Clarke** of Richmond, Director, Virginia Department of Corrections; **Francine Ecker** of Richmond, Director, Virginia Department of Criminal Justice Services; and **Margaret Schultze** of Richmond, Commissioner, Virginia Department of Social Services.

NCCD ANNOUNCES KATHERINE PARK AS NEW CEO

On July 20, 2015, the National Council on Crime and Delinquency (NCCD), a national nonprofit social science research organization, announced the appointment of **Katherine Park** as its chief executive officer. Park is the seventh leader of NCCD in its 108-year history.

Ronald Hughes, chair of NCCD's Board of Directors, said, "There is no better person to lead NCCD than Kathy Park. She is the engine behind some of NCCD's most notable accomplishments, including our expansion into the adult protection field and our Social Innovation Fund Pay for Success project." Hughes added, "Inside the organization, she is known as an exceptional manager of people and finances, determined to empower those

inside NCCD and out to create the greatest impact where it is needed the most. Kathy's leadership combines her incredible institutional knowledge with the vision needed to keep NCCD on the cutting edge of social justice work. We are confident that her strategic vision, her expertise in NCCD's areas of focus, her skill in building relationships inside and outside of the organization, and her commitment to improving the lives of children and families, vulnerable adults, and communities will serve NCCD well for years to come."

"I am honored to be entrusted with the leadership of this great organization," said Park. "At NCCD, we come to work every day with a shared goal: to change the lives of vulnerable people for the better, using approaches shaped by research. I am so proud and humbled to be supporting all of the talented people who make this work happen every day across the country and abroad."

Prior to serving as CEO, Park served as the organization's vice president for five years, and associate director of the NCCD Children's Research Center for six years. She has worked throughout her tenure in partnership with numerous state and local social services agencies across the United States and internationally to transform policies and practices in child welfare, juvenile justice, and adult protective services systems through an infusion of research-based and data-driven approaches to decision making.

SCHWEER RETIRES IN KANSAS

NAPE Vice President **Ronald G. Schweer**, the Chief U. S. Probation Officer for the District of Kansas, retired on July 31, 2015, following a distinguished career.

Schweer earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in criminal justice from Washburn University and a Master of Public Administration degree from the University of Kansas.

Schweer has over three and a half decades of experience in criminal justice, corrections, and law enforcement. He began his criminal justice career in 1977, in Paola, Kansas, as a deputy sheriff for the Miami County Sheriff's Department. From 1980 to 1981 he was a supervisor at the Youth Center at Topeka. In 1981 he went to work for the Kansas Supreme Court as a Court Services Officer in the 3rd Judicial District, a position he held until 1987, when he served as a fiscal analyst for the Kansas Legislative Research Department. In 1987 he was named Chief Court Services Officer for the 7th Judicial District of Kansas, a position he held until 1989, when he was named Court Services Specialist in the Office of Judicial Administration of the Kansas Supreme Court, where he was responsible for the coordination of all juvenile and adult probation services in Kansas. In 1990 Schweer was appointed a U. S. Probation Officer for the District of Kansas and rose to the position of Supervising U. S. Probation Officer. He was named Deputy Chief U. S. Probation Officer for the Eastern District of Missouri in 2000, a position he held until 2008, when he was named Chief U. S. Probation Officer for the District of Kansas.

He has served in a number of positions during his federal career, including administration of a field supervision unit, District Training Coordinator, Search and Surveillance Team member, Contract Specialist for drug aftercare and mental health treatment services, Home Confinement Coordinator, and WITSEC (Witness Protection) Officer. Schweer has also served as faculty

to the Federal Judicial Center in the Executive Team Leadership, New Supervisors Training Program, Circuit Supervisors Program, and two separate Officer Safety Training Programs.

In 1993, Schweer was selected as a Safety Trainer for the Federal Judicial Center and has presented safety programs to numerous districts throughout the United States. He has also served as a consultant to the Federal Judicial Center in the Applied Officer Safety Program since 1996. The National Institute of Corrections has sponsored a Safety Academy (Train-the-Trainer) Program since 1997 and he has served as a NIC consultant and faculty member in this program. As a result of this participation, Schweer has been involved in the training of safety trainers from virtually every state in the nation, including the territories of Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands.

He is also a safety consultant for the American Probation and Parole Association and has provided safety training through his affiliation with the Community Corrections Institute and the Sam Houston State University's Center for Project Spotlight, an innovative program involving police-probation partnerships. Schweer has served as a firearms instructor, assistant firearms instructor, OC spray instructor, and chairman of the Staff Safety Committee. He is a member of the Anti-Terrorism Advisory Council and the Search Enforcement Team. He was also the Co-Chair of the Safety and Information Reporting System (SIRS) Working Group at the Administrative Office of the U. S. Courts from 2004 to 2009. Schweer was a contributing author in the

National Institute of Corrections monographs titled *Staff Safety: New Approaches to Staff Safety, Second Edition* (2003) and *Guns, Safety and Proactive Supervision: Involving Probation and Parole in Project Safe Neighborhoods* (2008).

NEW CHIEF IN FAYETTE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

According to a Pennsylvania news service, a retired state trooper has been named Chief Adult Probation Officer for Fayette County, Pennsylvania, headquartered in Uniontown. **James "Cass" Caccimelio** assumed leadership of the department on August 10, 2015. President Judge **John F. Wagner** said he selected Caccimelio, a retired state trooper who served as the chief detective with the District Attorney's Office, from a pool of six applicants. "Based on his administrative law enforcement background, I thought he was the most qualified candidate," said Wagner.

Caccimelio, who earned bachelor's degree in administration of justice from Penn State University, replaced **Louis J. Lozar**, who retired in June. He was a state trooper for 26 years before he retired in January 2011. From December 2011 until his most recent appointment, Caccimelio served as the chief county detective with the District Attorney's Office.

ST. LEONARD'S SOCIETY OF CANADA PRESENTS THE JOHN BRAITHWAITE AWARD OF DISTINCTION

by

Robert E. "Bob" Brown

Upon reviewing the missions for the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE) and the St. Leonard's Society of Canada, it is readily apparent that they are compatible, both seeking justice in the justice system.

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.

The mission of St. Leonard's Society of Canada is to promote a humane and informed justice policy and responsible leadership to foster safe communities. It endorses evidence-based approaches to criminal and social justice; conducts research and develops policy; supports its member affiliates; and advances collaborative relationships and communication among individuals and organizations dedicated to social justice.

In pursuit of their respective missions both firmly believe that outstanding contributions deserve to be acknowledged and shared with the larger community.

The *John Braithwaite Award of Distinction* was created to honour those special people who have devoted their lives to the cause and vision of the St. Leonard's Society of Canada. It was first presented in 2003.

John W. Braithwaite has been a friend of the St. Leonard's Society of Canada since its earliest days, providing both support and inspiration. The Award recognizes outstanding achievement, mentorship, and a dedication that inspires and challenges our Society.

As a former Deputy Commissioner of the Correctional Service of Canada and a past President of the American Correctional Association (ACA), John was a good friend and colleague of **George J. Beto**, who served as Director of the Texas Department of Corrections from March 1962 until 1972 and who also served as President of the American Correctional Association. They remained close friends until Beto's death in 1991. Both Braithwaite and Beto were recipients of ACA's prestigious E. R. Cass Correctional Achievement Award.



John W. Braithwaite

John continues to inspire the criminal justice community in Canada through his ongoing dedication as a board member for both the British Columbia Criminal Justice Association and the Canadian Criminal Justice Association and a “co-founder” of the Vancouver Island Criminal Justice Association.

The 2015 *Braithwaite Award* was presented on June 6, 2015, on day two of St. Leonard’s Annual General Meeting (AGM) held in Canada’s capital, Ottawa. The 2015 recipient was also the guest luncheon speaker for the AGM. As a friend of St. Leonard’s and a true champion of justice in the justice system **Mary Campbell** was a well deserved 2015 award recipient.



Mary Campbell

During the award ceremony **Jim Murphy**, St. Leonard’s Treasurer and Director at Large and former Director of Community Relations at Correctional Service of Canada, shared the following comments concerning the 2015 award recipient.

An expert in sentencing, corrections and legislative reform, Mary has led or participated in all major correctional law reforms at the federal level of Canada since 1985. Mary has testified before committees of the House of Commons and the Senate, advised ministers and their deputies, and taught law to graduate students.

Mary’s achievements in the field of social justice are legion. Ever the voice for reason and fairness in a field that can be overrun by event-based social and legislative change, Mary has been at the forefront of evidence-based and research-informed criminal justice policy development for over 25 years.

In addition to this legislative legacy, as Co-Chair of the Federal/Provincial/Territorial High Risk Offenders Work Group, she has contributed immensely to the development of practices and protocol that support the release and reintegration of dangerous and high risk offenders into the community. Aside from the

Ministers Responsible for Justice, Mary has been called on as an expert to assist and advise various bodies in respect of high risk offenders and community safety.

Throughout her career Mary has been a strong voice for progressive corrections. As a supporter of St. Leonard’s LifeLine service, she did not hesitate to “blast” the government’s decision to cancel the program. She is the personification of professionalism in corrections. She has sustained her passion and enthusiasm in pursuing correctional best practice in the face of “tough on crime” rhetoric. In retirement, she continues her life-long values-based leadership, speaking out against regressive corrections and inspiring a new generation with a vision of a more just and humane correctional system. Mary Campbell is a kindred spirit of John Braithwaite in her unwavering integrity and courage in untiring efforts towards correctional reform.

Now more than ever, Canada’s reputation for a balanced, progressive, and human rights centered criminal justice system is at stake. The current political and social climate in Canada threatens to erase the gains of the last 25-30 years with a speed and tenacity that is breathtaking. Mary’s voice needs to continue to be heard and followed. I believe this positions her to be a most worthy recipient of the 2015 *John Braithwaite Award of Distinction*.

In receiving this award Mary joined a remarkable group of colleagues and past recipients who are firm in their belief that for justice to be done it must be seen to be done. It is significant to note that the 2007 Award winner was **Donald G. Evans**, a member of NAPE and a leader in community corrections. Justice was done in relation to these two award winners who both exemplify the same dedication to seeking true justice that was and continues to be the daily goal of John W. Braithwaite.

R. E. “Bob” Brown is an independent criminal justice consultant based in Victoria, British Columbia and working internationally in Africa and China. He is the former Director of the Corrections Programme at the International Centre for Criminal Law Reform and Criminal Justice Policy, a former District Director of the Vancouver Island Parole District, and is currently on contract with the United Nations Development Programme assisting the Somaliland Minister of Justice to implement a parole system.

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.

What We Do

- Assist in and conduct training sessions, conferences and workshops on timely subjects unique to the needs of probation executives.
- Provide technical assistance to national, state and local governments, as well as private institutions, that are committed to improving probation practices.
- Analyze relevant research relating to probation programs nationwide and publish position papers on our findings.
- Assist in the development of standards, training and accreditation procedures for probation agencies.
- Educate the general public on problems in the field of probation and their potential solutions.

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 _____

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

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

NAPE

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES
www.napehome.org



Sam Houston State University

MEMBER THE TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM™

www.shsu.edu
