

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

SPRING/SUMMER 1996

KIPP NAMED EXECUTIVE OF THE YEAR

Richard A. Kipp, Chief Probation Officer of the Lehigh County Adult Probation and Parole Department in Allentown, Pennsylvania, is the 1996 recipient of the Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year Award. This award, given annually by the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University in recognition of exemplary and sustained service by a probation administrator, was presented to Kipp at the Association's annual awards breakfast on June 30, 1996, in Chicago, Illinois.

Kipp, who has recorded two decades of dedicated service to the community corrections profession, earned a bachelor's degree from Iona College in New Rochelle, New York, and a Master of Social Work degree in 1981 from Marywood College in Scranton, Pennsylvania. He began his career in community corrections as a juvenile probation officer; within a year he was promoted to Supervisor of the Adult Probation Division. When the department was divided into two separate departments in 1980 — Adult and Juvenile — he was appointed Chief Adult Probation Officer. Since that time, he has headed an agency which, through his leadership, has become recognized as one of the best in the United States and Canada.

During his distinguished career, Kipp has been affiliated in a leadership role with a number of professional organizations and initiatives. He has served on the Board of Directors of the National Association of Probation Executives, representing the Mid-Atlantic Region, and was recently elected the organization's Treasurer. In addition, Kipp is past President of the Pennsylvania Chief Probation Officers Association, member of the American Correctional Association and past Chair of the Adult Probation and Field Services Standards Committee, member of the Board of Directors and Chair of the National Safety Committee of the American Probation and Parole Association, member of the Pennsylvania Association of Probation, Parole, and Corrections, member of the Lehigh County Intermediate Punishment Board, consultant to the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency and the Pennsylvania Commission on Sentencing, and member of the Management Task Force of the U.S. Department of Justice Narcotics Interdiction Project.

Kipp serves on the faculty of the Allentown College of St. Francis deSales in Center Valley, Pennsylvania, and the College of St. Francis in Joliet, Illinois; he is also a member of the faculty of the National Institute of Corrections, and is frequently called upon to provide training in the area of officer safety, a subject on which he has become a recognized expert. He has written a training curriculum on officer safety and has had articles appear in publications of the National Institute of Corrections, *Police*, and the *Pennsylvania Association of Probation, Parole, and Corrections Journal*.

In addition to his involvement in professional organizations, Kipp has been very active in youth sports. He has served as a basketball, soccer, and baseball coach for a number of neighborhood and religious organizations.

He is an enlightened community corrections administrator who is respected by his staff and peers. As Chief Probation Officer, Kipp has developed a number of innovative programs in his department worthy of replication. In 1986 and 1989 the department received national accreditation; in 1994 the department was the recipient of the first APPA President's Award for its Special Program for Offenders in Rehabilitation and Education (SPORE). Too, the department, under Kipp's leadership, is consistently found to be in compliance with audits performed by the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole.

In 1991 Kipp was the recipient of the Pennsylvania Bar Association's Liberty Bell Award. That same year, the Pennsylvania Senate honored him with a resolution commending him for outstanding community and state service. In 1995 the New England Council on Crime and Delinquency recognized him for his outstanding contribution and service during the 56th Training Institute. Kipp also received recognition by the Supreme Court of the State of Arizona Adult Services Division and the Juvenile Justice Services Division of the Administrative Office of the Courts for his "contributions and dedication to probation education in the state of Arizona" through his participation at the 1995 Arizona Probation Conference.

Kipp is a dedicated public servant who gives unselfishly of his time and talents. He is a truly deserving recipient of the Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year Award for 1996.

CONTENTS

Message from the Past President, <i>Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Ed.D.</i>	2
Message from the President, <i>Dave Savage</i>	2
Thoughts on Administering Community Corrections, <i>George M. Keiser</i>	3
Mission Critical Technology Development in Probation, <i>Donald Cochran, Ed.D.</i>	5
Handling Technical Violations of Probation In-house, <i>Arthur J. Lurigio, Ph.D., Nancy Martin, J.D., Marylouise Jones, and Laura Rizzardini</i>	6
Operation Habilitation, <i>Lawrence T. Jablecki, Ph.D., and Robert Clapp</i>	10
Criminal Justice Meets Education in the Classroom, <i>Linda J. Romano</i>	14
News From the Field	15

MESSAGE FROM THE PAST PRESIDENT



For those of you who were unable to be in Chicago for the APPA Annual Institute, I can report that NAPE sponsored two major and successful events. On the evening of June 29, we were pleased to sponsor a collation for current and prospective members. It provided a great opportunity for NAPE members to renew acquaintances and enjoy each other's company. On the following morning, we sponsored the annual Awards Breakfast, featuring remarks from George Keiser of the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) and a presentation to Rick Kipp of Lehigh County, Pennsylvania, as the Probation Executive of the Year. Rick's wife and two boys were able to join us for the presentation. Congratulations again to Rich. Finally, NAPE coordinated four well-attended Executive Track Workshops and appeared as panelists at many others, including an intensive session on Sunday. We are pleased to report that NAPE member Norm Helber delivered the opening address at the APPA Institute.

At the meeting in Chicago, I completed my tenure as President of NAPE and passed the baton to our new President, Dave Savage. I want to take this opportunity to thank our many active members, Directors, and Officers who were so helpful and forthcoming when asked to undertake work on behalf of our organization. Whether it was a request to serve as a presenter for the Executive Track at the APPA Institutes, contribute to or act as Guest Editor of *Executive Exchange*, or serve on a committee, invariably I was met with complete cooperation and a willingness to serve. My heartfelt thanks to all I called on for assistance.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT



- As a member of National Association of Probation Executives I have benefited greatly from affiliation with other probation executives facing issues similar to those that I face. Their experiences and perspectives have always been willingly shared and most helpful to me. Being a member of the board and serving as an officer have been distinct honors. As the newly elected president of NAPE I am committed, along with the other board members and officers, to provide direction and leadership for this vital organization.
- Immediate Past President Ron Corbett has set a direction and pace that I respect and expect to maintain. Through his leadership, and the leadership of his predecessors, NAPE has grown and flourished as a professional organization for probation executives.

I have met with the new officers and we are collectively committed to furthering the interests of NAPE by continuing and initiating the following agenda:

Dave Savage
President

Together, I believe we have moved NAPE ahead in the last two years. Among our collective accomplishments are:

- the establishment of a new Secretariat, housed at Sam Houston State University (SHSU) and under the very capable leadership of Dan Beto;
- a substantial upgrading in the quality of *Executive Exchange*, both in terms of its design and appearance as well as its content. Again, Dan Beto as Editor and Christie Haney as his assistant deserve kudos;
- the formation, at NAPE's instigation, of the National Coalition of Community Corrections Associations (NCCCCA), comprised of the Presidents of the major professional associations, who meet regularly to discuss matters of common concern. We thank George Keiser and Rick Faulkner of NIC for their generous support and assistance;

- the initiation, in collaboration with SHSU and NIC, of a development project aimed at the design and delivery of a Executive Training Program for newly appointed probation executives.

Our new Officers and Board of Directors, with Dave Savage at the helm, have already charted a direction for further growth and development for NAPE (see Dave's letter in this edition). I pledge to them my full cooperation and assistance.

Probation executives need an organization committed to their unique interests. NAPE is poised to fully address those needs. Best wishes to Dave and the new crew!

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Ed.D.
Immediate Past President

THOUGHTS ON ADMINISTERING COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

by
George M. Keiser
Chief, Community Corrections Division
National Institute of Corrections
Washington, D.C.

The following thoughts were shared by George Keiser at the NAPE Awards Breakfast, held in conjunction with the APPA Annual Institute in Chicago, Illinois. Mr. Keiser, Chief of the Community Corrections Division of the National Institute of Corrections for the past 13 years, was asked by Ron Corbett, outgoing President of NAPE, to comment on issues or themes that he experiences as he travels around the United States and what he thinks should be of concern to probation administrators.

As I share the following thoughts with you, I share them not as a peer, but as an outsider, a person who has worked in the field in the past and now manages a "consulting firm." In that regard, it is much easier to share observations as an outsider than it is to have to live with the pressures 24 hours a day.

We are entitled to nothing by virtue of our positions. As I travel around the country, one of the common themes that I hear from probation staff is how little they are appreciated. I can identify with that human feeling of frustration that people ought to know more about what we do, particularly the things we do on their behalf, and yet they don't. The stark reality is we have no entitlement to be appreciated. People take for granted what you do well. They don't understand it, and for most of their lives are too busy to even want to begin to explore it. Because of various messages bombarding them, their assumption is they shouldn't have to learn about your business. The reality is that if we want people to understand, to appreciate, to acknowledge the good services they have, we are going to have to more deliberately market our product to our communities of interest.

I deliberately use the word "market" as opposed to public education or public relations. For me the concept of marketing begins with a tangible product. It is not merely providing knowledge or information, nor is it enhancing a relationship between the consumer and our organizations. Instead, I think it starts with a product. Our being clear about what it is that we produce has a benefit to people who live in our communities. If we can't clearly, in plain English articulate those various benefits that we bring to the community, then we need to stop at that point and understand why we are not appreciated. Once we can articulate our product line, and understand its genuine benefit for people who live in our communities, we will secondly need to target the various audiences that need to hear and come to an understanding of those benefits. Don't anticipate that this will open the flood gates of admiration, but it is reasonable to expect it may be the beginning of understanding.

We need to learn from people who do what we do in other business worlds. I personally find it fascinating to visit with people who do things similar to what we do at the National Institute of Corrections and to learn what techniques and approaches have made them successful. For example, the National Institute of

Corrections has two basic business functions. One is that it is a large brokerage house. It receives requests for technical assistance and training and matches those requests with capable providers of those services. In doing this business we are a large consulting firm. While we don't have the staff time to deliver most of that consultation directly, through our knowledge of people around the country we are able to link the requester of the service with competent consultants. It has been important for us to learn, in many instances, from people outside of criminal justice how to be effective in carrying out that business. The other side of the Institute's business function is to serve as a public sector foundation. Here we look at issues that cut across geography, the various cultures represented in this country, to identify issues rather than solutions that need to be addressed in all of the various states of the country. As a foundation, and looking at other successful foundations, we have learned that it is important to be able to craft processes that require people to confront these issues in a deliberate knowledgeable way in order to shape solutions that make sense for them. As a public sector foundation, we've learned that it is more important to develop the capacity of people to solve their own problems rather than to sell them "cookie cutter" solutions.

As you see yourself in the substance abuse treatment, education, job development, business creation endeavors, or whatever the "business" really is, there are others out there who are doing similar kinds of things but from a different vantage point. It is important that we learn how to be successful from observing other successful people.

We need to do the right things, not just do things right. With so much activity coming our direction, we frequently concentrate on getting the procedure correct. We want to be sure our "i's" are dotted and our "t's" are crossed. For some that is important because that is how we are made, that is our personal inclination. For others it is important because they have already been burned and they want to try to protect themselves from being burned again in the future.

Our time of service is relatively brief. If it is to count for anything, then we have to stop long enough, from time to time, to question whether the things that we are doing are worth doing. We have to ask ourselves the question, "Are we doing the right stuff?" It's the question of effectiveness rather than efficiency. During times of increasing competitive pressures between being called upon to produce yet one more program and at the same time reducing your budget, we will continue to be challenged to do the right things and not to be consumed in just doing things right.

We need to be very clear about what business we are in. I am constantly amazed as I travel around the country and visit with various groups about the frustration that staff have, at all levels within organizations, based on a lack of knowledge of what business they are really in. Again they have been so caught up and so busy in carrying out a wide variety of activities, that they frequently have not sat down and understood the business that they are in. For some who have been employed for a long period of time, that means coming to a recognition that the current business conducted by the organization is not the job for which they were originally hired. For others it becomes an awareness that their own personal gifts and talents, abilities and interests frankly don't match up with the business currently being done by the agency. In

some cases its just not being clear about what we really want this business to accomplish.

Its frightening to find out that the job you were hired to do no longer exists and what you really expected to do is something quite different. It's frightening if you don't think you possess the right skills, knowledge, and ability, as well as an inclination to want to do that kind of business. At that stage, frankly, it may be important to ask and answer such questions as "Are there other things I can do? Want to do? Am in a position to do?" While frightening, I do think for people's health and the health of the organization, that it is much better to confront, acknowledge, and to deal with these issues rather than to be frustrated, unhappy, and unproductive.

We need to hire the people today who can do the business tomorrow. Oh sure, that is just exactly the kind of glib statement I would expect a consultant to make. If I didn't know all of the changes that we would go through in the last ten years, how can I be expected to hire people now that I think will manage the changes of the next ten years. Well, the key is probably not in the specifics of that change but in the fact that we will undoubtedly be going through change. It doesn't take a great visionary to understand that with the combination of technology, economics, media, and general turmoil around public service, there will be a constant demand for change in the relatively near future. We are not headed into a period of marked long term stability. As a result, we need to be looking at a workforce that is not so rigid and so locked in to a single way of doing business. Failing to pay attention to whom we are bringing into the organization, what they represent in terms of their personal values and in terms of their personality styles, may cause you far more problems in the long run than any other single business factor.

We need to learn to manage mutual self interest more selflessly. Ours is a culture which has, in the past several decades, promoted a tremendous amount of individualism and the fulfillment of our own self interest even at the expense of others. It is uncommon for people representing various groups and organizations to be able to come together, listen to each other clearly, focus on issues, and be willing to give up individual controls and resources for the benefit of the larger group.

It starts with our lack of ability to listen. In meetings, we spend far more time anticipating, thinking through and positioning ourselves for what we want to say, rather than listening and genuinely hearing the issues of the others at the table. We tend to look at issues almost exclusively from our own perspective, and have a great deal of difficulty at looking at those very same issues from the perspective of the other people at the table. It is work to be challenged, to hear from the dialogue and to be able to articulate somebody else's self interest in a way that they can say, "Yes you did hear me, you do understand."

Until we are able to communicate at that level, it is very difficult for us to focus on outcome rather than activity. It is very difficult for us to understand where our various self interests at times collide and compete and in other instances are compatible. It is in our ability to identify how many of those self interests are in fact compatible. How many of them overlap? Even when they are not identical, which gives us our greatest potential for change. As we are able to identify the compatibility of numerous mutual self interests, it gives a diverse group the opportunity to buy into a new solution.

However, the identification of the mutual self interests and the ability to articulate them is not enough. If those mutual self interests are to become a reality, a process will have to be managed to make it happen. The mutual self interests will not just fall into place.

Community corrections is not for those who deserve it. As I travel around and I look at various programs that have been created, and particularly as I look at the eligibility requirement to participate in some of these programs, I question whether I could get in. I'm not sure that if you really knew my background that I'm pure enough, and certainly if you understood my self discipline, I question whether I could follow through with all of the requirements that you would place upon me. Community corrections programs based on knowledge, based on our having researched what does in fact work and what it takes to make it work, would suggest that community corrections is not for those people who deserve it, who have earned it, but should be targeted for those people who pose certain types of risks — risks for which interventions do exist and which can make a difference. It is necessary for us to be knowledgeable enough and courageous enough to insure that disciplined programs are created for specific populations. Programs disciplined both in their being built upon a foundation of knowledge and not just emotional bias and the discipline of the activities required to fulfill the intervention. Isn't it amazing that we are surprised when programs built on our emotions and conducted without any consistent follow-through provide no benefit.

Appropriations are not a gift. One of my great frustrations is to visit a jurisdiction and to listen to an administrator talk about how many millions of dollars the county board or the state legislature "gave" the organization the past year. If we think those are gifts, we must be the only people who believe that. Certainly as taxpayers we don't believe in giving away money. And given the scrutiny that legislatures are under, I find it difficult to believe that they would like to have it characterized as money they have given away. No, we need to think in terms of appropriations as investments. A limited amount of money, being competed for by a variety of different interests and organizations, will be invested at the end of some county or state legislative process. If we understand this as an investment strategy and not a gift, it will increase the urgency with which we develop our business plan, our prospectus. It will clarify for us the necessity to be able to articulate specific benefits and products that are delivered by our organizations. And hopefully it will create an awareness on our part that there is an expected return on that investment for which we are responsible.

Excellence is a lifestyle, not a technique. I wish I were a prolific writer and had spent the last decade producing books on the subjects of success and excellence. I have to believe in that case I would have been a wealthy man by now. These are themes that have sold well and continue to sell well in our culture. All too frequently the people who are purchasing are looking for that one new gimmick, one new technique that would put them over the edge. It is my strong belief, based on, I think, some diligent observations that say to me that the consistently high performers, people who I categorize as successful, as being excellent in what they do, do it because it is their lifestyle, not because of some book they read, some seminar they attended, or some technique they learned. Oh, they are skillful,

and yes they do read, and they are constantly learning, but they do this in order to expand the tools that they use in their business. It is, however, their personal discipline, the way they attend to their business, which is their lifestyle, which makes the real difference. They are marked in two very clear ways. First, they are genuinely concerned for others. They make time to pay attention to people who are around them. Without judging the altruism of their motivation, they have an understanding that these people are their business and will be their means to success. They take seriously what that means and they demonstrate a concern, an interest, an appreciation which people recognize and understand is uncommon in our culture. Secondly, they pay attention to small things. They may not be tremendous detail people, who spend every waking hour again dotting that "i" and crossing that "t," but they do understand that it is frequently the little thing that trips up the big initiative. As a result, they pay attention to those little things. If they don't do all of them, fix all of them, they frequently employ people who do.

Disciplined passion inspires people. For all of the cynicism, the teaching of techniques, and the development of the antihero in our culture, we are still inspired by a disciplined passion. We want to believe that we can in fact make a difference. If we are going to go to work we would prefer to be at work with people engaged in making that difference. It is the linkage of the discipline with that passion that keeps us grounded on a firm foundation, gives us the strength for the long term duration and provides a consistency for how we live out that passion. These qualities raise us above an emotional roller-coaster and create for us a genuine inspiration.

It was a real pleasure to be invited to come and be able to share my own personal musings with you, a group of administrators who are in the trenches everyday. My last challenge for you would be that you would take the time to stop and to think and to identify what one word you would want to be remembered by. What single word of description do you want to be attributed to who you are as a supervisor or as a co-laborer? Write that word down. Keep it with you. Inventory what you do and how you do it, to see if you really live up to it.

MISSION CRITICAL TECHNOLOGY DEVELOPMENT IN PROBATION

by
Donald Cochran, Ed.D., Chair
Community Corrections Committee
National Institute of Justice
National Law Enforcement and Corrections
Technology Committee
and
Commissioner of Probation
Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Since its inception in the late nineteenth century, the field of probation has operated nationally under a wide variety of organizational structures and practices. Despite the diversion in probation practice there are three mission critical functions carried out by all agencies. The functions are: (1) investiga-

tion; (2) supervision/control of offender; and, (3) accurate record keeping.

Recognizing that the use of innovative technologies is essential to law enforcement, prisons, jails, and community corrections programs, the National Institute of Justice (NIJ) joined with National Institute of Corrections (NIC), the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA), and the Department of Defense (DoD) to share and develop technologies that would be of value in both the justice and military arenas. Growing out of a memorandum of understanding between the various federal entities, NIJ changed the name of the National Law Enforcement Technology Centers to the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Centers and tasked the newly established Centers to work closely with state and local agencies in identifying and developing law enforcement and corrections oriented technology.

Two meetings of the Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Advisory Committee have been held in Charleston, South Carolina. The first meeting was in June 1995 and the latest in July 1996. These meetings were attended by over 100 federal, state, and local corrections professionals (many of the attendees were NAPE members).

At the most recent meeting, the overall need of the community corrections field was identified as the development of technologies that: (1) would allow officers to spend more time with offenders; (2) identify methods and technologies that enhance the management of larger groups safely and successfully with less staff time; and, (3) determine the difference between high and low risk individuals and deal accordingly with these individuals.

By focussing on the overall need statement and the mission critical functions, five major problem areas for community corrections agencies were identified and specific suggestions were made regarding the development of technologies that would allow probation practitioners to work smarter and safer in dealing with the over three million offenders that make up the caseload of community corrections agencies in the United States.

Officer safety was identified as a critical requirement. The development and refinement of the following technologies for use by community corrections agencies have been suggested to NIJ. Officer locator systems adapted for probation work, such as, three-dimensional locators for use in high rise urban buildings, distress alarm systems, and vital signs monitors. Also, considerable work needs to be done to develop more effective less-than-lethal protective weapons systems.

Because law enforcement and community corrections agencies are both trying to improve safety and the overall quality of life in communities, it is important that probation agencies have integrated communications systems with law enforcement as well as access to appropriate law enforcement intelligence information.

Another area where technological improvement is needed revolves around offender information. Comprehensive interactive systems need to be developed to improve the collection and dissemination of information on offender profiles and histories. The matching of an offender profile with control strategies and the available community resources would lead to substantial improvement in agency effectiveness in the supervision of offenders. Given the increased mobility of the present day offender, inter/intrastate information sharing has

become a crucial need. The need for accurate, reliable, and up to date information is important in the transfer of cases under supervision. Because of the dynamic nature of trying to control the risk of an offender in the community, there is a need to have technology that improves information access and reliability. In identifying offender risk it is important that we no longer be limited to the past practices of only using information that is easily available. This improvement in risk needs assessments has to be integrated into treatment histories and the evaluation of the effectiveness of past and present offender supervision strategies. Also, because the offender population is so mobile, digitalized photograph and improved offender tracking systems are desperately needed to enhance the effectiveness of probation agencies.

A third important area that needs technological development is in the control of offenders being supervised in the community. Improvement in the technology of electronic monitoring is needed with multiple technologies, including tethering, kiosks, and voice recognition. The development of more cost effective portable satellite tracking systems is needed by community corrections agencies. Given the pervasiveness of substance abusers under community supervision, cost effective portable drug detection and screening technology is a critical need for probation agencies. Given the predatory nature of sex offenders there is a need for technological tools to better monitor and control the sex offenders while in the community. Technology to improve victim protection is needed especially in sex offender, domestic violence, and child abuse cases. Technology is also needed that will improve our community correction agencies investigation and record keeping systems in collection of all financial orders. Automated credit reports and work histories would be two examples that would improve investigations and collection rates. Finally, there is a need to build upon adult literacy technology to develop effective life skills training programs for offenders.

A fourth technology requirement involves equipment. There is a need for testing and evaluation by NIJ Technology Centers of new equipment that may be used by community corrections agencies. This testing could lead to standards development and would resolve problems associated with the purchase of “voodoo” technology. Access to the evaluation, standards setting information and vendor data could be made available on JUSNET. Priority access to appropriate DoD and other government agency excess equipment could improve probation agencies bottom line performance. Assistance in developing open systems, and non-proprietary software is a crucial need in community corrections. Automated systems need to be developed so that smaller agencies can benefit by resource economies through group purchasing of equipment.

The final requirement that was identified was staff development and training. Given the increased complexity and dynamic nature of the requirements for effective probation officers, familiarity with the new technology advances are needed in pre-service and in-service training. Distance learning with standardized terminology, teleconferencing, simulation, and interactive multidimensional training technology is a more efficient way to train, assess, and evaluate officers and programs.

The management and staff associated with the National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology (NLECT) programs are committed to work with agencies and professional organi-

zations such as NAPE to develop technological solutions to the myriad problems facing present day probation systems. As we near the twenty-first century the opportunity to collaborate with NLECT is a truly exciting opportunity for all probation practitioners.

HANDLING TECHNICAL VIOLATIONS OF PROBATION IN-HOUSE: EXPERIENCES AND ADVICE FROM COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS

by

Arthur J. Lurigio, Ph.D.
Director of Research,
Nancy Martin, J.D.
Chief Probation Officer,
Marylouise Jones
Senior Research Assistant,
and
Laura Rizzardini
Research Assistant

In September 1995, the Cook County Adult Probation Department (CCAPD) implemented a pilot program in response to the increasing number of technical violations of probation petitions filed before the Circuit Court of Cook County, Illinois. CCAPD, under the auspices of the Circuit Court, is the largest probation department in Illinois and the fourth largest in the country. CCAPD supervises more than 34,000 adult probationers and also provides pretrial assessments, services, and case supervision for nearly 14,000 defendants. In addition to standard caseload supervision, CCAPD operates a variety of special programs, including intensive probation supervision, home confinement, intensive drug probation, gang intervention unit, mental health unit, and victim services.

In the current article, we describe CCAPD's special program for handling technical violations administratively (i.e., without filing petitions to initiate formal court hearings). We also present a sample of the findings from an evaluation of program operations and impact.

Violations of Probation

Revocations are a necessary but unwelcome aspect of probation operations. When officers file petitions to revoke the probation of offenders who continue committing crimes, probation's basic surveillance function is directly served. On the other hand, when officers file petitions to revoke the probation of offenders who fail to complete treatment, opportunities are lost for probationer reintegration and rehabilitation. With increasing emphasis being placed on punishment and surveillance, probation agencies are implementing more restrictive programs and more probation violators are being sent to prison. Effective probation strategies are needed to address these developments.

During the past twenty years, rates of incarcerations have doubled in state and federal institutions. Higher percentages of offenders have gone to prison for longer terms and with

fewer hopes for parole because of stricter laws and sentencing enhancements. An unprecedented number of offenders are now behind bars in the United States (Camp and Camp, 1994). Projections indicate that extensive use of incarceration will continue well into the next century, exacerbating the already severe prison crowding problem.

Since the late 1970s, backdoor admissions to prison have also contributed significantly to institutional crowding. For example, from 1977 to 1987, admissions to prisons nationwide grew by nearly 300% as a result of parole and probation violations, which far exceeded the rate of increase in court cases during the same time period (Austin, 1989). In some states, two-thirds of prison admissions are composed of probation and parole violators (Parent, Wentworth, Burke, and Ney, 1994). A large proportion of these admissions did not involve new arrests. Moreover, probation and parole violators have also caused crowding problems in jails. Specifically, as technical violators await final hearings, many are detained in local jails or serve jail time as a sanction for violations, resulting in institutional crowding at the local level (Burke, 1994).

Parent (1993) suggested five major factors to account for increases in technical violations of probation. First, the mission of probation has changed from treatment and rehabilitation to surveillance and control. Second, stricter supervision strategies have given officers more opportunities and technologies to detect violations. Third, probation professionals' primary educational backgrounds have switched from social work to criminal justice orientations. Hence, "today's recruits may be better equipped to understand issues of power and authority than they are to understand human behavior and how to change it" (p. 8). Fourth, probation caseloads have become more serious; larger numbers of offenders with lengthier criminal histories, more serious instant offenses, a greater likelihood of drug abuse, and earlier contact with the criminal justice system are being sentenced to probation. Finally, a wider breadth of sentencing options and programs has meant more conditions of release and more occasions for probationers to break rules.

Several states, including Oklahoma, Oregon, and South Carolina, have reevaluated their violation and revocation practices in order to reduce prison and jail overcrowding, to conserve their limited resources, and to alleviate the burden that technical violations place on probation and court personnel (Parent et al., 1994). These states are rethinking the role that in-house sanctions play in overall caseload management strategies; they are developing new procedures for handling infractions; and they are beginning to employ a continuum of intermediate sanctions in response to violations. A recent development in the field involves dealing with technical violations administratively (i.e., responding to rule breaking internally instead of bringing cases back to court).

CCAPD Revocation Data

Lurigio (1986) studied 500 felony probationers sentenced in Cook County during a five-year interval (1979-1983) for the purpose of identifying predictors of rearrest. He found that the most common cause of probation revocations was rearrest (45%). He also reported that only 30% of the revocations were for technical violations. More than half (55%) of all the violations led to a recommitment to probation, often with an exten-

sion of offenders' current sentences, while 22% of the new arrest revocations led to jail or prison terms.

Cook County revocation data were later analyzed by Cunniff and Shilton (1991) in a national study of felony probationers, including samples of cases from thirty-two jurisdictions across sixteen states. The investigators gathered case information from a group of Cook County adult probationers sentenced in 1986. Forty-one percent of these offenders had been involved in at least one violation of probation hearing: 39% were for technical violations, 36% were for new arrests, 23% were for absconding, and 2% were for new convictions or miscellaneous infractions.

After the 1986 group had been on probation for nearly three years, 52% had successfully completed their probation, 28% were still on probation, 10% had absconded, 9% had their probations revoked, and 1% left probation for other reasons (e.g., death). Compared with other jurisdictions in the investigation, Cook County's rate of successful completions was significantly higher than the overall average of 32%, and its rate of revocations was significantly lower than the overall average of 22%. The department had the fifth highest rate of successful completions and the fifth lowest rate of revocations (Cunniff and Shilton, 1991).

In 1994 and 1995, more than 9,000 technical revocations were filed, representing 77% and 75%, respectively, of the total number of revocations filed. From 1983 to 1995, the absolute percentage of technical violation petitions increased 45%. This substantial growth may be explained partially by the addition of special probation programs, such as intensive probation supervision and home confinement. These programs have more stringent conditions of release and therefore accelerate the rate of technical violations, which generally are viewed as less serious than new arrest revocations. Nevertheless, they involve comparable levels of preparation, paperwork, and court time; impose a significant strain on probation and court resources; and may be precursors to criminal activity.

CCAPD's TVP Program

CCAPD has developed administrative guidelines for selecting proportional responses to technical violations of probation (TVPs). These guidelines allow probation officers to process TVPs in-house. As a result, punishments can be imposed with greater certainty and swiftness, and court calls can be reserved for more serious criminal cases. The overall goal of these procedures is to improve the quality of probationer services, to make probation a more effective sentencing alternative, and to standardize and simplify TVP decisions. They are also designed to increase probation's rehabilitative potential by permitting officers to immediately identify, address, and remedy offenders' problematic behaviors. In formulating these procedures, CCAPD adopted the Committee on Criminal Law and Probation Administration's definition of a TVP: "A TVP will include any breach of a court order of probation, except an allegation of a subsequent criminal act, alleged in a formal criminal charge." Under no circumstances do in-house TVP procedures permit probation officers to alter any existing court-ordered conditions of probation. Furthermore, unless otherwise stipulated by a judge, home confinement and Treatment Accountability for Safer Communities (TASC) violations are not eligible for the in-house TVP protocol.

The program’s design benefited greatly from the National Institute of Correction’s Technical Assistance Project on TVPs (Burke, 1994). Based on the project’s work in the Department of Correctional Services (Cedar Rapids, Iowa), the current program includes the following elements in its basic revocation policy (Burke, 1994): (1) responses to every violation (zero tolerance policy); (2) responses to violations that are proportional to the severity of the specific rule breaking and offender risk; (3) responses to violations that result in consistent sanctions for similar rule-breaking activities; (4) responses to violations that address both offenders’ needs and risk; and (5) responses to violations that have the potential for long-term positive impact in the larger context of an overall supervision strategy.

In-house TVP procedures are initiated after probationers violate a condition of probation supervision other than rearrest. Offenders are notified of their rights and given the option of participating in the program or returning to court for formal violation of probation hearings. Those choosing program participation waive their rights to court hearings and are informed of the program’s procedures and the sanctions that are being imposed for their rule breaking.

Probation officers select appropriate responses to infractions by employing a severity of sanctions grid that takes into account three factors. The first is the seriousness of the infractions as specified in a hierarchy from low seriousness (e.g., failure to notify a probation officer of an address change) to high seriousness (e.g., refusal to participate in court-ordered treatment). The second is the seriousness of probationers’ instant offenses as determined by the class of felony conviction defined in the Illinois Compiled Statute (i.e., class 1 through class 4). The third is probationers’ current classification levels as indicated by the Illinois Case Classification System (i.e., low, medium, and high). The combination of these three factors locates infractions on a grid that prescribes a level of appropriate punishments (see figure 1 for a sample grid). For example, level 1 punishments — the least severe — include increased frequency of reporting and up to 30 hours of community service. Level 3 punishments — the most severe — include home confinement up to eight weekends and 200 hours of community service.

Figure 1

SEVERITY OF SANCTIONS GRID

SERIOUSNESS OF TVP (MEDIUM)

		CLASSIFICATION LEVEL		
Serious of Probation Offense		Maximum	Medium	Minimum
	High	Level 3	Level 2	Level 2
	Medium	Level 3	Level 2	Level 1
	Low	Level 2	Level 2	Level 1

Standard procedures for handling TVPs in-house have several potential advantages. First, the procedures can reduce the amount of court time judges and probation officers spend processing TVPs. The benefit for both groups is greater time to spend with more serious cases. Second, reduction of officers’ time in court can free them to concentrate on building stronger relationships with probationers and providing more effective supervision and referrals for services. Third, internal TVP procedures can encourage the use of intermediate sanctions and increase the swiftness, certainty, and, in some cases, severity of punishments. Fourth, in-house TVP procedures can result in more uniform and fairer punishments for rule infractions. Fifth, swift and certain punishments for TVPs can enhance the credibility of probation officers and the courts and make probationers more accountable for their behaviors. Sixth, standardized, in-house revocation procedures can be used effectively to coerce offenders to comply with treatment orders. Finally, compliance with reporting schedules and other special conditions of probation can result in fewer new arrests.

Study of the TVP Program

Methods

We pilot tested, for approximately six months, the in-house TVP procedures in eight courtrooms. The purpose of the study was to examine the implementation and effects of the program. The investigation employed various data collection strategies. We interviewed, in-person, judges and managers (i.e., supervisors and deputy chief) and administered self-report surveys to probation officers involved in the special program. We collected data on the cases processed through the program and also investigated whether the program reduced the number of TVPs being filed in court by comparing the number of court cases heard during the pilot program with the number filed during a comparable period in 1995. We present a sample of the study’s findings in the current article. (For the complete findings, see Lurigio, Jones, and Rizzardini, 1996.)

Results

Officers’ surveys. Most of the probation officers surveyed (75%) were very or somewhat satisfied with the TVP program. According to participants, the most positive aspect of the program is that it permits officers to spend less time in court and more time with clients. One respondent stated that the program has resulted in officers “having more control over probationers. Minor conflicts can now be dealt with on a one-to-one basis without judge or attorney interference.”

Handling TVPs in-house seems to be improving officers’ relationships with probationers. Participants reported that most clients are responding favorably to being given another chance to follow the rules and they seem relieved that they will not be incarcerated for infractions.

Managers’ surveys. Managers in the TVP program were interviewed to assess their satisfaction with the program and to elicit their evaluations of program effectiveness. All the respondents involved in the TVP project indicated that they were generally satisfied with the effort. According to participants, the program has improved probation officers’ ability to work with offenders and has increased offenders’ accountability. Managers were pleased that officers have the authority and responsibility for implementing a zero tolerance policy in

response to rule breaking. The following quote illustrates managers’ perceptions of the advantages of the TVP program:

One of the positive aspects of the program is that once [probationers] are informed that sanctions are going to be [leveled], fewer of them are violated. It puts a little bite into the authority of probation officers.

Managers stated that the TVP program is effective in handling noncompliant probationers. They reported that the program gives officers the authority and structure they need to respond quickly and fairly to rule infractions. Supervisors indicated that they agreed with the vast majority of probation officers’ revocation decisions. In their opinion, the program has forced officers to become more conscientious about documenting their responses to rule breaking. As a consequence, “the program has built trust with the judges that we are going to address issues in a timely and documented manner.” Moreover, they observed that handling TVPs administratively has increased both probation officers’ contact with offenders and probationers’ compliance with the conditions of probation. Respondents thought that the program may be less effective with older offenders, who seem to be less responsive to the threat of sanctions.

Judges’ surveys. All of the judges interviewed had very favorable comments regarding the TVP program. They recognized its potential to conserve judges’ resources and time for more serious cases. And nearly half of them noticed a reduction in the number of TVP petitions appearing on their court calls since the program began.

TVP data. As presented in Table 1, 260 probationers had their technical violations handled through the TVP program from December 1995 through May 1996. None of the probationers approached with the option of having their TVPs handled in-house opted to go back to court. On the average, each judge in the special project had 33 offenders processed with the TVP protocol. An average of 44 probationers each month were diverted from the court call, ranging from a high of 56 in-house TVPs in January 1996 to a low of 31 in-house TVPs in February 1996. Judge number 8 had the highest number of TVPs diverted from his courtroom (n=55), Judge number 1 had the lowest (n=19).

Table 1

Number of Technical Violations Handled Through the TVP Program

Judge	12/95	1/96	2/96	3/96	4/96	5/96	Total
Judge 1	1	5	0	6	2	5	19
Judge 2	7	8	7	4	4	4	34
Judge 3	5	3	5	2	4	2	21
Judge 4	5	9	4	7	5	5	35
Judge 5	4	3	4	4	9	4	28
Judge 6	1	10	5	3	10	5	34
Judge 7	15	5	2	5	6	1	34
Judge 8	10	13	4	6	12	10	55
Total	48	56	31	37	52	36	260

Conclusions and Recommendations

Based on our study and the results of other research and writings on this topic, we offer a few suggestions for implementing in-house TVP programs. Planning an in-house TVP program should involve judges and other criminal justice system personnel. In Cook County, the CCAPD had the enthusiastic support and input of the judiciary from the onset of the initiative. The program was strongly advocated by Judge Thomas R. Fitzgerald, Presiding Judge of the Criminal Division of the Circuit Court. Judges in the pilot courtrooms helped to develop and review the policies and procedures of the TVP program, and met with program staff on a regular basis to assist in refining the central aspects of the project. State’s attorneys, public defenders, the Clerk of the Circuit Court of Cook County, and members of various bar associations were also apprised of the program and asked to discuss its impact on their agencies and court operations. As Parent et al. (1994) noted, “agencies and officials whose support is critical for the success of the [TVP program] should be drawn into planning, development, and implementation” (p. 38). In keeping with this recommendation, the watchwords of our program have been collaboration, cooperation, and information-sharing.

An in-house TVP program must be guided by explicit policies and structured responses (Parent et al., 1994). Policies help to define the goals of the program and to clarify staffs’ roles and expectations regarding the revocation process. Standard practices insure that offenders are treated equitably and that officers approach all TVPs in a consistent and reasoned manner.

To be most effective, program guidelines should include graduated sanctions for rule breaking so that the severity of punishments is proportional to the seriousness of infractions. Responses to rule breaking should involve a range of community-based sanctions and services. Probation officers must have a series of viable options when responding to TVPs; otherwise, their ability to match punishments with infractions will be sorely diminished. Program guidelines must also take into account offenders’ rights to due process. Probation departments must recognize that administrative responses to TVPs are governed by less stringent due process requirements than are criminal court proceedings (Parent et al., 1994). Hence, they should be mindful of the legal implications of in-house revocation practices. For example, we were cognizant of case precedents when we incorporated informed consent in our TVP procedures. Probationers are clearly aware of their presumptive rights to have their TVP cases heard before judges. This protective device is designed to forestall any subsequent legal challenges.

Prior to program initiation, mechanisms must be in place to train staff and to monitor the implementation process. TVP program officers felt that they were adequately prepared to use the guidelines and that they had the resources needed to put the protocol into practice. Without enough special training and resources, in-house TVP programs will fail to have their desired impacts. And without an ongoing evaluation to oversee the implementation process, the program has fewer avenues for improvement. Evaluation is a way to identify and solve small problems before they become big problems. It is also a way to distinguish between program design failures and program implementation failures. According to Parent et al. (1994), [Probation] officials should ensure that resources are provided to monitor and evaluate the [TVP] response.

Monitoring will let officials determine if the response is working as intended, and if not, to make midcourse corrections. Evaluation data can show whether the response achieved its objectives, determine both what it costs and what it saves, and identify how the response affects other parts of the organization.

The in-house TVP protocol was designed to reduce officers' time in court and to allow them to focus more attention on caseload supervision and management activities. To offset the increased paperwork that the TVP program necessitated and to decrease the amount of time probation officers were spending in court waiting for their cases to be heard, CCAPD implemented a court liaison unit staffed with officers who specialize in courtwork. Coupling the TVP initiative with the court liaison program was crucial. The latter freed officers from court duties and gave them more time to process the extra paperwork required to handle TVPs in-house.

Overcoming probation officers' reactions to the additional paperwork of the TVP program, however, was a hurdle in the initial stages of implementation. Officers thought that the protocol was sound, understood how to use the grid, and believed that TVP decisions were generally fair and accurate. But they still perceived that the additional paperwork was onerous and time consuming. As a consequence, CCAPD is considering ways to streamline the TVP protocol without sacrificing the basic elements of the program such as informed consent, zero tolerance, and supervisors' approval of officers' sanctioning decisions.

In conclusion, in-house TVP protocols offer a number of important advantages. They allow probation officers to maintain more control over their caseloads and to cultivate closer relationships with their clients. They also free judges' time to focus on more serious cases. With an in-house TVP protocol, probationers go back to court only after other measures have been undertaken to modify their behaviors. Furthermore, TVP guidelines help to insure that technical violations will be addressed more efficiently and equitably by standardizing the criteria employed to select appropriate sanctions. Future research should address the short- and long-term effects of TVP guidelines on probationers' performance and on agency and court operations. We believe that such research will demonstrate that in-house TVP protocols are an innovative and feasible strategy for handling probationer rule breaking, which benefits both probation departments and the court.

References

Austin, J. (1989). *Parole outcomes in California: The consequences of determinate sentencing, punishment, and incapacitation on parole performance*. San Francisco: National Council on Crime and Delinquency.

Burke, P. B. (1994). Probation violation and revocation policy: Opportunities for change. *Perspectives*, 18, 24-31.

Camp, C. G., and G. M. Camp (1994). *The Corrections Yearbook, 1994*. South Salem, NY: Criminal Justice Institute.

Cook County Adult Probation Department. (1995). *TVP and court liaison programs: Policy and procedural guidelines*. Chicago: Author.

Lurigio, A. J. (1986). *Describing and predicting recidivism among felony probationers: A limited replication of the RAND study. Case classification research project: Report no. 6*. Chicago: Cook County Adult Probation Department.

Lurigio, A. J., M. E. Jones, and L. Rizzardini (1996, July). *An evaluation of the TVP and court liaison programs*. Chicago: Cook County Adult Probation Department.

Parent, D. G. (1993). Structuring policies to address sanctions for absconders and violators. In E. E. Rhine (Ed.), *Intermediate sanctions for probation and parole violators* (pp. 7-15). Laurel, MD: American Correctional Association.

Parent, D. G., D. Wentworth, P. Burke, and B. Ney (1994). *Responding to probation and parole violators*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice.

The authors are all employees of the Cook County Adult Probation Department in Chicago, Illinois.

OPERATION HABILITATION

by
Lawrence T. Jablecki, Ph.D.
Director
Brazoria County Community Supervision
and Corrections Department
and
Robert Clapp, M.A.
Program Coordinator
Brazoria County Community Supervision
and Corrections Department

The following is a description of Operation Habilitation, an intensive supervision program developed and operated by the Brazoria County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Angleton, Texas. The text of this article served as the basis of a presentation delivered during the 21st Annual Training Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association held earlier this year in Chicago, Illinois.

The Paradigm of Habilitation

Operation Habilitation is grounded in the acceptance of a paradigm capable of explaining the thinking and conduct of the majority of criminal offenders and providing an ideal or goal towards which they should be directed. Admittedly, a single concept, regardless of how comprehensively defined, cannot explain or embrace all conceivable cases and situations. The best we can do, therefore, is to employ a concept, the explanatory power of which is consistent with the greatest degree of actual experience.

The paradigm is the concept of "habilitation," or a civilizing process in which the thinking patterns and habits of conduct of criminal offenders are turned in the direction of constructive activity and consciously responsible behavior. This is distinguished from the still widely accepted model of "rehabilitation" which unavoidably commits one to attempting to restore

or return the criminal offenders to a prior negative or irresponsible condition. The paradigm of habilitation is empirically grounded in the fact that the majority of criminal offenders, whether juveniles, adult probationers, inmates or parolees, demonstrate the absence of a prior healthy or constructive state and that it would be a serious mistake to attempt to restore them to what they were.

The goal of habilitation carries the collateral commitment to a comprehensive and methodical utilization of community resources for the numerous and urgent needs of the probationer, i.e., a vital part of our mission is to be case managers and brokers of services. This dimension of our mission, however, must not be emphasized at the expense of minimizing our crucial role in the process of supervising criminal offenders. Highly educated and experienced Community Supervision and Corrections Officers can facilitate positive changes in the thinking and conduct of persons under their supervision. All of us can and should help change the direction of many lives and this is the habilitative or educational process summarized in Socrates' teaching that the "unexamined life is not worth living."

Background

Operation Habilitation provides intensive supervision and systematic intervention for high-risk felony probationers. It functions by simultaneously addressing two primary considerations, specifically the assurance of the probationer's compliance with court-ordered conditions of probation and the removal of barriers to the probationer's being a self-sustaining and productive member of society. The impetus for this program was the crisis in the criminal justice system in Texas. In 1989, sweeping changes were made in the Texas criminal justice system. Prisons were overflowing, recidivism rates were staggering, and revocation of probation trends were soaring. A move toward more effective community corrections was mandated. Pursuant to this mandate, the name of adult probation departments in Texas was changed to community supervision and corrections departments. A point in time and circumstances had been reached when partial and fragmented efforts to re-direct criminals were no longer applicable. Massive reorganization of strategies and focused resource mobilization were required.

Operation Habilitation was instituted on September 1, 1990. Now in its sixth year of existence, it is no longer an experimental project. It has become one of the core programs of the Brazoria County Community Supervision and Corrections Department.

Program Design

During its genesis in 1989, two primary questions emerged as the focus of the program design; specifically, who are the genuinely high-risk felony probationers and how can the community's wide array of resources be systematically mobilized to effectively divert them from further criminality?

Identification of High-risk Felony Probationers

Early identification of probationers at high-risk to be revoked became the subject of extensive empirical research. The

research included the study of hundreds of case records of felony probationers who had been revoked and others who had successfully completed their probation. Particular scrutiny was made in the area of response to supervision during the first year of probation. The department and the University of Houston collaborated in the analysis of the data. Forty-seven statistically significant differences were identified. Although no single variable was particularly remarkable, their combination, forming the collective profile, became a powerful indicator of high-risk.

It is significant to point out that prior to the statistical analysis of the department's data conducted by the University of Houston in which the forty-seven variables were identified, an identifiable profile of unsuccessful felony probationers and the common problems associated with those cases were becoming empirically established facts. More specifically, the department's study of the 136 felony revocations during fiscal year 1989 yielded the following general description. He was an unmarried caucasian male under 30 years of age who had been on probation an average of twenty-nine months at the time of revocation. He had not completed a high school education, he was unemployed at the time of revocation and he had been arrested at least once during his time on probation. His revocation was the consequence of committing another felony offense and the offense was committed in the context of drug/alcohol abuse.

Using the above profile, 50 felony probationers were identified and by random selection 25 became the original caseload for Operation Habilitation, and 25 became the control group, remaining unidentified in the department's general caseload.

Interagency Coordination System

One of the key concepts or birthing beliefs of Operation Habilitation is that the program design must include a formalized and comprehensive community resource delivery structure capable of addressing the multitude of factors associated with recidivism, i.e., the offenders must be viewed, supervised and counseled "holistically...as opposed to intervening with them as if they could fragment their problems for the sake of the organizational imperatives of correctional programs" (Fabelo, 1995).

The holistic perspective requires, therefore, contractual agreements and interagency procedures with community resources embracing the rubrics of substance abuse, literacy, employment, anger management, cognitive skills, mental health and home environment.

Case Planning and Case Management

All probationers assigned to one of the four caseloads of 25 in Operation Habilitation are assessed by a representative of each of the participating agencies. These professionals and the officers assigned to the caseloads constitute the Task Force, with the two major responsibilities being to develop the habilitation plan and meet on a regular basis to formulate the collective case management. On one or more occasions, the probationers are invited to these meetings and given the opportunity to actively participate in the planning of their supervision.

Operation Habilitation Today

The program remains firmly committed to the paradigm of habilitation, and the empirically verified profiling process for identifying cases in which recidivism and incarceration are genuine high probabilities remains a powerful predictive instrument. In 1995, however, the Director of the department became persuaded of the urgent need to concentrate all of the program's resources on young felony offenders between the ages of 17-24 and juveniles who are certified as adults and placed on community supervision.

The justification for using age as the sole criterion for assignment to one of these caseloads is as follows: According to the most recent FBI statistics contained in the Uniform Crime Report, 90% of the most serious crimes in the United States are committed by males between the ages of 17-24. The meaning of this ubiquitous brute fact is that there is a fundamental relationship between crime and the "crime-prone ages" which many experts identify as 14 to 17. More specifically, this relationship is called the "age-crime curve" and any theory of the cause(s) of crime that ignores or minimizes its significance is inherently defective. Violent crimes such as homicide, rape, robbery and assault are committed by young males with a history of juvenile delinquency, aggression, the pursuit of instant gratification of their desires, no reflection on the negative consequences of their actions, and the idea of imprisonment or incarceration does not deter them because they do not think about it. Although the population under community supervision does not contain many of these young violent offenders, the presence of the "age-crime curve" is made abundantly obvious by the fact that of the fiscal year 1994 felony revocations, 66, or 44% of the 151 sample cases were between the ages of 17-24. This means that 34% of our felony cases under direct supervision constituted 44% of our revocations.

The other major change in the program involves the progressive implementation of the mandatory condition of completing 70 hours of instruction in the acquisition of cognitive skills. Hindsight disclosed that this had been the "missing link" in Operation Habilitation in the sense that inadequate attention was focused on the vital importance of the offender's cognition:

...what and how he thinks: how he views his world: how he reasons: how well he understands people: what he values: and how he attempts to solve problems — play a critical role in his criminal behavior. It also suggests that the best way to correct antisocial behavior and values is to teach prosocial behavior and values (Ross, et al., 1988).

Summary

Operation Habilitation has proven to be a viable program in addressing the needs of high-risk felony offenders. While it has been effective, changes will continue to occur within this program to better serve a troubled population.

References

Fabelo, Tony (1995). *Bulletin from the Executive Director*. Austin, Texas: Criminal Justice Policy Council, No. 20, p. 1.

Ross, Robert R., Elizabeth A. Fabiano, and Roslynn D. Ross (1988). "(Re) Habilitation Through Education: A Cognitive Model for Corrections," *Journal of Correctional Education*, Vol. 39, No. 2, June, p. 46.

OPERATION HABILITATION

The following is a statistical summary of the tracking of the 349 felony probationers supervised in Operation Habilitation from September 1, 1990, through August 31, 1995, and the Control Group of 25 felony probationers.

Outcomes	Number	Percent
Probationers remaining under supervision	282	81%
Probationers revoked	57	16%
Probationers completed sentence	8	2%
Probationers deceased	2	1%
	349	100%
Analysis of the 16% Revocation Rate Revoked while in Operation Habilitation	44	77%
Revoked following the completion of Operation Habilitation	13	23%
	57	100%
Reasons for Revocation		
New felony convictions	31	54%
New misdemeanor convictions	6	11%
Technical violations only	20	35%
	57	100%
Types of Felony Offenses Resulting in Revocations		
Possession/delivery of drugs	12	39%
Theft	11	35%
Burglary	4	13%
Assault	3	10%
Murder	1	3%
	31	100%
Types of Misdemeanor Offenses Resulting in Revocations		
Theft	3	50%
Substance abuse	2	33%
Trespass	1	17%
	6	100%
Types of Technical Violations Resulting in Revocations		
Substance abuse	9	45%
Absconded supervision	11	55%
	20	100%
Outcomes of the Control Group		
Revocation rate	17	68%
Successfully completed probation	6	24%
Remaining under supervision	2	8%
	25	100%
New felony convictions	13	76%
New misdemeanor	3	18%
Other violations of terms of probation	1	6%
	17	100%

OPERATION HABILITATION Caseload Demographics April 30, 1996			Monetary Related Offenses		19%
Demographic Variable	Number	Percent	Robbery	Theft	
Age			2	8	
16 and Younger	0				
17	2	2%			
18	9	10%			
19	28	30%			
20	16	17%			
21	14	15%			
22	11	11%			
23	9	10%			
24	3	3%			
25	2*	2%			
	94	100%			
Gender					
Male	78	83%			
Female	16	17%			
	94	100%			
Ethnicity					
Anglo	49	52%			
African-American	23	24%			
Hispanic	22	24%			
	94	100%			
Last Grade Completed					
7	1	1%			
8	7	7%			
9	22	24%			
10	18	19%			
11	26	28%			
HS graduate	7	7%			
GED	12	13%			
Some college	1	1%			
	94	100%			
Probationer Resides With					
self	4	4%			
Spouse	3	3%			
Common law	8	8%			
1 parent	29	31%			
Both parents	27	29%			
Grandparent (s)	12	13%			
Other (relative/friend)	11	12%			
	94	100%			
Instant Offenses	Number	Percent			
Drug Related Offenses					
Possession of Controlled Substance	14	32%			
Delivery of Controlled Substance	16				
	30				
Property Offenses					
Burglary of a Vehicle	11	36%			
Burglary of a Building	7				
Burglary of a Habitation	12				
Criminal Mischief	4				
	34				

COSTS OF OPERATION HABILITATION From September 1, 1990 Through August 31, 1995		
Salaries and fringe benefits	\$	629,000.00
Grant funding from the State		616,000.00
	\$	1,245,000.00
Costs of Operation Habilitation in Fiscal Year 1995	\$	275,000.00
Fiscal Year 1995 costs for one person in Operation Habilitation	\$	2,750.00
COSTS OF INCARCERATION IN THE INSTITUTIONAL DIVISION OF THE TEXAS DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE		
The 1995, average costs, per day, per inmate	\$	44.40
Annual costs for one inmate	\$	16,206.00
The annual costs of incarcerating the 282 probationers who have completed or remain in Operation Habilitation would be	\$	4,570,000.00

*1 case pending completion of cognitive class
1 case on Operation Habilitation Caseload by Court Order
2

CRIMINAL JUSTICE MEETS EDUCATION
IN THE CLASSROOM:
CHANGING LIVES THROUGH
LITERATURE

by
Linda J. Romano
Criminal Justice Consultant
and
Executive Assistant
Changing Lives Through Literature
Newton, Massachusetts

Changing Lives Through Literature (CLTL) is an alternative sentencing program that began as an experiment. It is the outgrowth of many conversations between two friends from different disciplines who were frustrated with the typical institutional and conventional responses to social alienation. The two friends, Judge Robert J. Kane and Dr. Robert P. Waxler, wanted to create an academic and criminal justice collaborative response to working with repeat offenders on probation. Their premise was that literature can influence lives.

They discussed their idea with Probation Officer Wayne St. Pierre of the New Bedford District Court, who agreed to participate in the experiment. In 1991 the New Bedford District Court and the University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth began a 12 week literature seminar taught by Dr. Waxler, Dean and Professor of English. One stipulation Dr. Waxler had was that the participants be repeat offenders who were most likely on their way to prison. What began in 1991 as an experiment has now expanded to twelve distinct programs within the Massachusetts Trial Court; nine programs for men and three programs for women. Information about starting similar programs has been distributed nationally and internationally.

Dr. Waxler initially volunteered his time and later applied for, and received, a small grant from a local foundation. The program used grant monies for several years until July 1994 when it gained funding through the Massachusetts State Legislature.

Literature as a Tool

"I really believe that of all the tools we have to humanize the world, literature remains the most powerful," says Dr. Waxler. This belief is one of the founding premises behind CLTL.

Throughout the centuries, educators have insisted that literature offers a powerful, and often profound, way to explore the human condition. Literature, it has been said, not only mirrors life, but illuminates it. In an important sense, the reading of literature is an investigation of the patterns of a society and an inquiry into the behavior of individuals within that society. A close reading of literary texts gives us an understanding of ourselves.

In this context, the program offers a series of literary seminars for criminal offenders. In these seminars, probationers explore, through discussions of modern short stories and novels, patterns within our society that are related to such issues as violence, masculinity/femininity, and individual identity.

The purpose of the seminars is two-fold: (1) to offer the participants an opportunity to explore, through discussion of

literary texts, patterns of consciousness that appear to operate within our culture; and, (2) to offer participants an opportunity to enhance their verbal skills, their self-esteem, and their imaginative and critical intelligence.

How it Works

The literature seminars are held on a college campus and span twelve to sixteen weeks, depending on the program team. Seminars are taught by a Professor of English or Literature with the probationers, a judge, and a probation officer as equal participants. The assigned short story or novel is discussed, not court cases or personal legal problems.

The program has strict rules. While studying, participants are on probation and must abide by all the conditions of their probation. Anyone who misses class or skips readings can be sent to prison. Program graduates remain on probation and must attend one or several aftercare workshops focusing on career choices, education options, and stress reduction. After-care programming for CLTL graduates continues to evolve.

The founding program at the University continues and will begin its 17th seminar in September 1996. The first program for women began in 1993 at Middlesex Community College and takes referrals from the Lynn District Court and the Lowell District Court. That program's team consists of a professor, a judge, and probation officers from each referring court. That program too will begin a new seminar in September.

Evaluation

Preliminary evaluations have been completed on the New Bedford/University of Massachusetts at Dartmouth program and the Lynn/Lowell Women's Program. The results are encouraging.

The New Bedford Program evaluation looks specifically at crimes committed prior to involvement in CLTL and after completion. The data covers ten groups, completed between 1991 and 1995. During this time period 68 probationers graduated from the program. The results show an overall 68% decrease in criminal activity.

The Lynn/Lowell Women's program also recently completed a preliminary evaluation looking at offenders who completed the program 1993 through April 1996. The data suggests that 65.6% of the program participants did not reoffend. The evaluators took a look at the Risk/Need supervision levels of program participants and found no women from the minimum supervision category had participated in the program. In fact, 77.3% were under maximum level supervision and 22.7% were moderate level supervision cases.

Summary

In closing, I will use a quote from a paper written in 1994 by Judge Kane and Dr. Waxler:

The men in this program are smart. They have often survived brutal family histories, drug and alcohol addiction, and their own pent up rage. They range in age from 19 to 45. Some are married; some are not. Some have children of their own, a future that they want to make contact with, even help to nurture. Language and literature can help deter violence and crime and at the same time add important dimensions to a sense of manhood. These men learn that lesson through this program. As one of the men once put it,

walking into a college classroom where his opinions are valued by a college professor and a judge was a challenge superior to the one he found on the streets. We are convinced that through reading and discussion of literature these men are bringing hope away from that long wooden table in our seminar room. We are also convinced that literature can indeed help to change lives.

(For further information contact Linda J. Romano, Executive Assistant for CLTL at (617) 332- 8848.)

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

NEW OFFICERS ELECTED

During the Association's annual meeting held in Chicago, Illinois, on June 30, 1996, new Officers and Directors were elected to serve two year terms. Members of the new Executive Committee include:

President	Dave Savage (Washington)
Vice President	Elyse Clawson (Oregon)
Secretary	Dan Richard Beto (Texas)
Treasurer	Richard A. Kipp (Pennsylvania)
Immediate Past President	Ronald P. Corbett, Jr. (Massachusetts)

Serving as Directors for the next two years are:

New England Region	Robert J. Bosco (Connecticut)
Mid-Atlantic Region	E. Conway Bushey (Pennsylvania)
Central Region	James R. Grundel (Illinois)
Southern Region	Arlene Parchman (Texas)
Western Region	Barry Nidorf (California)
At Large	Don R. Stiles (Arizona)
At Large	Robert Bingham (Michigan)

NAPE MEMBERS CONTRIBUTE
TO FEDERAL PROBATION

The March 1996 issue of *Federal Probation* was devoted to management issues, and three of the articles appearing in that publication were written by members of the National Association of Probation Executives.

Barry Nidorf, Chief Probation Officer for Los Angeles County and a member of the NAPE Board of Directors, contributed "Surviving in a 'Lock Them Up' Era." Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., President of NAPE and Deputy Commissioner of Probation for Massachusetts, wrote "When Community Corrections Means Business: Introducing 'Reinventing' Themes to Probation and Parole." Finally, Dan Richard Beto, the

Association's Secretary and Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas, contributed "Success in the Organization: A Primer for Probation Officers Seeking Upward Mobility" with Melvin Brown, Jr., Director of the Montgomery County Department of Community Supervision and Corrections.

NAPE MEMBERS PRESENT
AT 1996 APPA INSTITUTE

During the 1996 APPA Training Institute held in Chicago, Illinois, on June 30 to July 3, 1996, a number of members of the National Association of Probation Executives served as presenters, including Richard A. Kipp, Don R. Stiles, John Larivee, Norm Helber, Dot Faust, Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Nancy Martin, Alan M. Schuman, Robert L. Bingham, Dave Savage, Nancy M. Lick, and William D. Burrell.

In addition, NAPE was responsible for the Executive Training Track at the APPA Institute in Chicago and has been asked to handle that segment of the 1997 APPA Institute in Boston next year.

GUEST EDITORS NAMED
FOR EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

The following NAPE members have volunteered to serve as guest editors for future issues of *Executive Exchange*: Dave Savage, Fall 1996; Robert L. Bingham, Winter 1997; Barry Nidorf, Spring 1997; and, Robert Bosco, Summer 1997.

Members desiring to contribute articles to these issues or who would like to volunteer to serve as guest editor are encouraged to contact Christie Haney at the Secretariat.

NAPE SECRETARY ELECTED
TO ACA DELEGATE ASSEMBLY

In July 1996 Dan Richard Beto, NAPE's Secretary, was elected to the Delegate Assembly of the American Correctional Association. He was elected to this body as a representative of an institution of higher learning. Beto will serve a two year term, commencing in August 1996.

BOSTON IN 1997

The next meeting of the National Association of Probation Executives will be held in Boston, Massachusetts, in conjunction with the 22nd Annual APPA Training Institute in August 1997. Boston is a historic city with plenty of excellent restaurants. Members with access to the Internet may acquire a wealth of information about Boston by contacting <http://www.boston.com/>.

RIDGELY RECOGNIZED

NAPE member William D. Ridgely, Deputy Administrator of the Division of Probation and Parole for the State of Wisconsin, was presented with the William L. Frederick Award by the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association (PPCAA) at its annual meeting in Chicago, Illinois, on June 30, 1996. Ridgely, a past President of PPCAA, was recognized for his years of dedicated service and for promoting the compact.

NEW MEMBERS JOIN NAPE

Since the last issue of *Executive Exchange* was published, several probation executives became members of the National Association of Probation Executives. The new members are listed below in alphabetical order:

Judith M. Collins
Chief Probation Officer
District Court Probation Dept.
Salem, Massachusetts

George W. Corkery
Assistant Chief Probation Officer
Essex Co. Superior Court
Lawrence, Massachusetts

Stephen E. Eyrick
Chief Probation Officer
LaPorte County
Probation Department
Michigan City, Indiana

Ronald Goethals
Director
Dallas County
Community Supervision and
Corrections Department
Dallas, Texas

Robert D. Golder
Chief Probation Officer
Columbia County
Adult Probation Dept.
Bloomsburg, Pennsylvania

Ernest H. Gravatt
Chief Probation Officer
Washington County
Probation Department
Salem, Indiana

Charles E. Gregonis
Deputy Chief Probation Officer
Philadelphia Adult
Probation Department
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Cary W. Harkaway
Deputy Director
Multnomah County
Community Corrections
Portland, Oregon

Bobbie Huskey
President
Huskey and Associates
Chicago, Illinois

Lawrence T. Jablecki
Director
Brazoria County
Community Supervision and
Corrections Department
Angleton, Texas

Sylvia J. Johnson
Chief Probation Officer
Alameda County
Probation Department
Oakland, California

Robert L. Norem
Chief Probation Officer
Stanislaus County
Probation Department
Modesto, California

Verne Speirs
Chief Probation Officer
Sacramento County
Probation Department
Sacramento, California

Cherie Townsend
Chief Juvenile Probation Officer
Maricopa County
Juvenile Court
Phoenix, Arizona

Rick Zinsmeyer
Director
Williamson County
Community Supervision and
Corrections Department
(organizational member)
Georgetown, Texas

These new members are encouraged to become active in the business of the organization.

INFORMATION ABOUT EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

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

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

Submissions for publication consideration should be typed on 8 1/2 by 11 inch paper, double-spaced, with at least one inch margins. Manuscripts should be submitted in duplicate. Persons submitting articles, commentaries, or book reviews should enclose a brief biographical sketch or resume and a black and white photograph for possible inclusion. Manuscripts exceeding one page in length should be submitted on a computer diskette, with the software used indicated.

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

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

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