

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

SPRING 2001

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

This year marks the 20th anniversary of the founding of the National Association of Probation Executives. In the past two decades, we have seen our organization grow from a handful of probation executives to a membership that exceeds 250 leaders in community corrections.

When the organization was created in 1981, the founding members articulated a mission statement that is still with us today:

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 changes in the field, and making available a pool of experts in probation management, program development, training, and research.

In reflecting on the past 20 years, we need to ask ourselves the question: "Have we lived up to that mission statement?" From my perspective, the answer is a resounding "yes."

We assist in and conduct training sessions, conferences, and workshops on subjects unique to the needs of probation executives. The highly successful Executive Development Program, a cooperative initiative with the National Institute of Corrections and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University, has been in existence since 1997 and has positively impacted the lives of over 100 probation and parole executives, providing them with relevant management training that better equips them to carry out the duties of their very important and demanding jobs. In addition, members of NAPE routinely serve as presenters at state and national conferences and seminars where they provide information on innovative programs and practices and advocate strategies for a rational probation system.



We provide technical assistance to national, state, and local governments, as well as private institutions, that are committed to improving probation practices. It is not uncommon for NAPE members to be called upon by the National Institute of Corrections to provide technical assistance to jurisdictions throughout the United States. In addition, NAPE reached out to the Manhattan Institute and assumed a leadership role in the reinventing probation movement.

We were instrumental in writing and producing "Broken Windows" Probation: The Next Step in Fighting Crime and Transforming Probation through Leadership: The "Broken Windows" Model published by the Center for Civic Innovation of the Manhattan Institute. These two publications identify weaknesses in probation practices and provide a blueprint for a reinvigorated system. Likewise, our quarterly publication — *Executive Exchange* — carries articles relevant to probation management. Too, NAPE members regularly contribute articles to local, state, and national publications, adding to the body of knowledge of our profession.

We have developed a strong network where members can call upon one another for information and assistance. We have a list server that regularly disseminates articles and addresses of web sites that relate to management topics and correctional practices.

Most will agree that NAPE has made a tremendous contribution to the probation profession. Yet, despite all our accomplishments, there is much more we, as an organization and as individual probation executives, should be doing.

continued on p. 2

CONTENTS

President's Message	1
Problem-Solving Probation: An Overview of Four Community-Based Experiments	
<i>Robin Campbell and Robert Victor Wolf</i>	3
Successful Supervision Strategy for the Reinvention of Probation	
<i>Lawrence F. Tinsley</i>	11
Probation in a Changing Europe, <i>Donald G. Evans</i>	16
Church and State: Working Together, <i>Dan Richard Beto</i>	18
News From the Field	20

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE (cont'd)

In addition to expanding on training, technical assistance, and networking activities, we need to be more aggressive in advocating legislation, particularly at the national level, that influences correctional policy and promotes community corrections initiatives as a response to crime.

We need to continue to promote meaningful partnerships with law enforcement agencies, the faith community, agencies that deliver human services, volunteers, advocacy groups, and community organizations. These partnerships, if crafted appropriately, will engender support of probation programs and will enable us to be more effective in promoting public safety, responding to community needs, and providing offenders needed services.

As the world grows smaller, and as we see the rapid expansion of crime that respects no borders, we need to reach out to our colleagues in other countries and establish relationships that are mutually beneficial.

We need to remain current in our knowledge of technology, and how it might be used to assist us in carrying out our duties. Too, we should be receptive to experimenting with new technology that has been alien to our established method of operation.

And finally, we should always keep in mind, and remain committed to it, our leadership role in the criminal justice system. Leadership does not come from large bureaucracies, nor does it come from the work of committees; it comes from individuals who are willing to admit mistakes, assume responsibility, and who possess the courage to embark on new courses. It comes from the membership of NAPE.

Dan Richard Beto
President

INFORMATION ABOUT EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

Executive Exchange, the quarterly journal of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE), publishes articles, reports, book reviews, commentaries, and news items of interest to community corrections administrators. 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 or the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University unless so stated.

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

Submissions for publication consideration should be typed on 8½ by 11 inch paper, 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 photo-

graph 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 (936) 294-1675. Facsimiles may be sent to (936) 294-1671. All correspondence regarding *Executive Exchange* should be sent to the following:

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

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

PROBLEM-SOLVING PROBATION: AN OVERVIEW OF FOUR COMMUNITY-BASED EXPERIMENTS

by

Robin Campbell

and

Robert Victor Wolf

©Center for Court Innovation

Note: This article was supported by the Bureau of Justice Assistance under Grant Number 96-DD-BX-0090. Points of view or opinions in this article are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the United States Department of Justice.

Robin Campbell is a New York-based freelance writer. Robert Victor Wolf is Director of Communications at the Center for Court Innovation, a public-private partnership that promotes new thinking about how courts and criminal justice agencies can solve difficult problems like addiction, quality-of-life crime, domestic violence and child neglect.

Introduction

Probation was introduced to the United States in 1841, when a wealthy shoemaker named John Augustus asked a Boston judge to release a man charged with public drunkenness into his custody. Augustus brought the man home, had him sign a temperance pledge and three weeks later returned the man to court sober.

It would be hard to recognize probation today based on this simple, homespun beginning. At the end of 1999, there were more than 3.7 million people on probation in the United States, making it by far the most common sanction for criminal offenders. And while Augustus, known as "the father of American probation," worked only with drunks and minor offenders, 51 percent of probationers today have been convicted of felonies, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Modern probation departments are also having trouble replicating Augustus' early success with rehabilitation: Today, nearly one of every five adults charged with a violent felony is already on probation, according to a panel of probation experts convened by University of Pennsylvania Professor John J. Dilulio, Jr., and the Manhattan Institute. This has led to widespread public dissatisfaction with probation, and even admissions from probation leaders themselves that such dissatisfaction "has often been fully justified" (see *Transforming Probation through Leadership: The "Broken Windows" Model* by the Reinventing Probation Council, Manhattan Institute, New York, New York, 2000).

Faced with huge caseloads, high recidivism rates, and public disaffection, probation and correction departments around the country are trying to re-connect with the spirit of innovation that inspired Augustus 160 years ago. In some places, virtually everything is up for re-examination, from job descriptions and

department structure to the very principles underlying their work.

This exploration within the field of probation mirrors efforts taking place across the criminal justice system as police, prosecutors, defense attorneys and courts try to address a number of interrelated problems, including:

- Declining public confidence in the effectiveness of the criminal justice system;
- Concerns about "revolving-door justice" — offenders being processed through the system again and again;
- The growing volume of cases in the system, which makes it difficult to give individualized attention to particular victims or offenders; and
- The sense that players in the criminal justice system have become nothing more than processors, handling cases without regard to larger results like improving public safety, reducing recidivism or rehabilitating offenders.

One way the criminal justice system has begun to respond to these problems is by shrinking their operations to a more human scale. Large, centralized court systems are creating small, neighborhood-based community courts that focus on low-level crimes, like prostitution and public drinking, which undermine a community's quality of life. Prosecutors are taking some of their deputies out of the courtroom and placing them in neighborhood offices, where they partner with community members to develop innovative solutions to safety problems. Police are working more closely with average citizens and developing new programs that go beyond solving crimes to preventing crime before it happens. And probation departments are doing all of the above — opening neighborhood offices, partnering with the community and focusing on prevention.

"Community justice" has become the shorthand term used to describe these problem-solving efforts. Community justice tries to make the justice system more effective by re-establishing links between criminal justice players and the communities they serve. Guided by the philosophy of community justice, criminal justice agencies are asking some basic questions: What makes community residents feel unsafe? What resources can the community itself bring to bear on its own problems? How can criminal justice agencies — working with citizens, other government agencies and community organizations — address these problems in a way that produces lasting improvements? Community justice ultimately seeks to transform the very way people think about crime — not as cases to be processed but as problems to be solved.

This paper offers a window into how probation departments are using community justice to improve the way they do business. The paper describes in detail four distinct efforts to reform probation, and examines the lessons learned from these early experiments. Since community justice calls upon criminal justice agencies to adapt to local conditions, it's no surprise that the four programs are as varied as the jurisdictions they cover: a statewide program in Vermont gives hundreds of community volunteers the authority to determine and supervise the conditions of probation; a partnership between probation and police officers in Boston focuses on gang violence in a crime-ridden urban neighborhood; a top-to-bottom restructuring of the probation department in Deschutes County, Oregon, emphasizes crime prevention; and an experiment in "beat supervision" in Maricopa County, Arizona, places probation officers in direct and regular contact with the community.

While very different, the four programs are united in a shared commitment to making probation more effective. By building connections with local communities, focusing attention on broader goals like crime prevention and offender rehabilitation, and striving for ways to give probation staff more resources and lower caseloads, these programs seek to build renewed confidence in probation — both among the departments' own workers and the public at large.

Probation's Original Promise

In many respects, these four experiments are an attempt to fulfill probation's original promise as a tool for rehabilitating offenders. When probation was first conceived by Augustus in the 19th century, probation officers were expected to take an active interest in the details of offenders' lives to help them reform their ways and ensure their successful re-integration into society.

Unfortunately, many probation departments adhere to this vision on paper — in their charters and mission statements, for instance — but have given up on actually pursuing these ideals in practice. Huge caseloads, inadequate funding and lack of accountability have turned probation officers, especially in large urban jurisdictions, into little more than desk-bound bureaucrats. The average New York City probation officer has 240 cases, according to Michael Jacobson, former Commissioner of Probation for New York City and Professor of Criminology at John Jay College in New York. And in some urban jurisdictions, like Los Angeles County, caseloads can rise as high as 1,000 per officer.

Clearly, probation officers with caseloads that high don't have time to get to know individual probationers or the communities in which they live. When confronted with so many cases, probation officers try to prioritize offenders, giving what time they have to the most serious and potentially dangerous clients on their list while devoting few resources to the rest. This means that, at best, a handful of probationers may get the necessary referrals and support to guide them on the path of reform while the vast majority live in the community with virtually no supervision.

By and large, high caseloads have not translated into large budgets for probation departments. With incarceration drawing the lion's share of correctional dollars — \$20,000 to \$50,000 annually per prisoner compared to only about \$200 per probationer — probation departments are forced to be creative. In

New York City, where about 90,000 people are on probation, low-risk offenders are expected to report periodically to computerized kiosks. "With so little money being spent on probation, you have to make some choices," Jacobson said. "We decided to focus on the highest risk people and give them intensive supervision. But that means tens of thousands of people whom we deemed lower risk report to a machine. No one would call it an ideal situation."

And even when they do make referrals to supportive services like drug treatment and job training, most probation officers lack the time, training and resources to monitor outcomes. Are probationers staying in drug treatment and getting sober? Are they completing job-training programs and finding employment? Even more important: Are probationers complying with court mandates, including curfews and the all-important requirement that they avoid further trouble with the law? These questions relate directly to the public's concerns about safety and offender supervision and rehabilitation — but few busy probation departments have the time or resources to answer them.

Protecting the Public

"It's been amazing to me that when you ask your probation and parole staff to give you examples of what they do that protects the public, they're baffled," said a participant in a U.S. Department of Justice roundtable of probation leaders (see Rethinking Probation: Community Supervision, Community Safety, Office of Justice Programs, U.S. Department of Justice, December 1998). And yet protecting the public is exactly what probation departments need to do if they are to earn the public's support. It is precisely the potential dangers — periodically brought to the fore by news coverage of probationers who re-offend — that lead politicians and community leaders to criticize probation as "soft on crime" and call for its abolition. "There isn't another arm of government in which policy is based so much on individual incidents," Jacobson said. "When someone on probation does a horrible thing, it doesn't matter that for the last 9,999 cases nothing horrible happened."

The image of probation as a failure is reinforced by the numbers. Roughly half of all probationers fail to fulfill the terms of their probation sentence, and in any given year hundreds of thousands of probationers fail to report in. Even more disturbing: about two-thirds of all probationers are re-arrested for committing a different crime within three years of their sentence. In 1991, the nearly 162,000 probationers who went to jail for new offenses were responsible for at least 6,400 murders, 7,400 rapes, 10,400 assaults and 17,000 robberies, according to the Manhattan Institute.

Despite these alarming statistics, the nation remains heavily reliant on probation as an alternative to incarceration: at the end of 1999, there were 3.7 million adults on probation, which was more than twice the 1.8 million in prison. And growth in the probation population — about 3.8 percent a year since 1990, according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics — is expected to continue.

Changing the Job Description

While the four experiments described in the following pages are inspired by probation's historical ideal, they also represent

new strains of thinking. One key ingredient all the programs emphasize is a role for the community. Inspired both by Augustus' early hands-on experiments and by the principles of community justice, which call for creating partnerships between criminal justice agencies and ordinary citizens, these programs have sought to incorporate neighborhood residents and their concerns into their work. They do this in a number of ways:

- By placing probation officers in neighborhood offices, where they meet regularly with members of civic and merchant organizations to discuss their concerns about crime and their ideas for reintegrating offenders into the neighborhood;
- By partnering with local organizations and other government agencies to develop better referral networks and support systems for probationers in the community;
- By relying more extensively on community residents, including the relatives, neighbors and employers of probationers, to monitor and control the behavior of their clients; and
- By giving community residents a part in actually supervising or working with probationers.

These experiments are finding that increased contact between probation departments and communities benefits everyone involved. Since probation officers — even those assigned to a community-based office — cannot monitor their clients every minute of the day, neighbors, employers, relatives and anyone who comes in contact with probationers can serve as an extra set of eyes and ears. And community members are far more likely to report a problem or a violation if the probation officer is a friendly and trusted player in the community than an unknown stranger behind a desk in a central office far away.

Probation officers are also in a much better position to make appropriate referrals and help re-integrate their clients into a community if they're familiar with the neighborhood's resources. It isn't always enough to know the name of a local job-training program; a personal relationship with the director of the program, as well as with potential local employers, can make the difference between a referral that fails (because the program is full, or isn't geared to a probationer's particular needs, or because employers aren't willing to hire ex-offenders) and a referral that ultimately results in a probationer who is productively employed.

In addition, probation officers need to know a community and its citizens well, or they simply won't be able to address local safety problems. Probation officers who engage the community can find out where communities feel unsafe, and what local problems are the community's top priority. If crowds hanging out at a local corner instill fear in residents, probation officers can require their probationers to stay away from the area and not contribute to the problem. And if garbage in empty lots is a chief concern, probation officers can place probationers on clean-up crews.

The community benefits from this relationship in a number of ways. First and foremost, the community's concerns become incorporated into the development of probation strategies; this can give residents greater confidence in the criminal justice system and add to their sense of safety. Also, giving the community an active role in the re-integration of offenders gives citizens a personal stake in ensuring that, on the one hand, proba-

tioners follow the rules laid down by the court, and, on the other hand, probationers are given a meaningful second chance to lead productive lives as law-abiding citizens. In this way, safety and offender rehabilitation go hand in hand.

Maricopa County: Beat Supervision

Maricopa County, Arizona, brought these principles into play in 1996 when the county's Adult Probation Department established an experimental satellite office in a neighborhood known as Coronado. The county is part of metropolitan Phoenix and covers more than 9,000 square miles, making it larger in area than many states. But Coronado is only two square miles — a manageable size for an experiment in what is sometimes called "beat supervision."

Beat supervision borrows from the model of a cop on the beat, who is assigned to a particular neighborhood and over time gets to know the community, its inhabitants and its problems. Similarly, a "beat" probation officer works in a community office and is assigned probationers from the surrounding neighborhood rather than to a randomly selected roster of probationers from across the whole county. By introducing the beat model, probation officials in Maricopa hoped to tighten supervision of probationers and more effectively reintegrate them into the community.

The experiment was motivated by several factors. In the first place, a member of the probation staff had recently returned from a vacation in Madison, Wisconsin, with tales of that city's success with beat supervision. Secondly, the Phoenix Police Department had recently launched a community policing effort in Coronado, making it a natural location for an experiment in community-based probation.

"The police officers were already well known to the community and respected and associated with community safety, so by riding on their coattails, that eased affairs. It helped create the perception on the part of the public that we are part of law enforcement also," said Leslie Ebratt, Maricopa County's Adult Probation Officer Supervisor.

Furthermore, an active community organization in Coronado, the Greater Coronado Neighborhood Association, had recently received a grant from the Department of Justice for an anti-gang initiative and was looking for partners. This last point was especially fortuitous, although the group had to be persuaded that partnering with probation officers was a good idea.

"The neighborhood was terrified," says Kate Wells, a Coronado resident who was active in the neighborhood association at the time. The organization was afraid that opening a probation office in Coronado would harm the neighborhood by drawing criminals from other parts of the county. This fear needed to be confronted even though Coronado, with approximately 250 probationers among 10,000 local residents, had a higher than average probationer population. "It took three or four months to realize that [the probationers] were our neighbors," Wells recalls.

An Asset to the Community

Not long after probation officers moved into space provided by the neighborhood association in September 1996, the Coronado probation officers had an opportunity to demonstrate how they could in fact be an asset to the community. When the

roof of the building was severely damaged in a storm, the probation officers in Coronado organized approximately 40 probationers to replace it. Guided by the probation officers, the probationers also repainted the building's exterior and landscaped the grounds, leaving the place far more attractive than when they moved in. "They set off on the right foot right from the start," recalls Wells. "They did a tremendous amount of work."

"Part of what we're trying to do in the neighborhood is enhance the community in general," explains Ebratt. "We believe that by doing so, we reduce crime. Not just crime committed potentially by our offender population; we make it less of an environment to support crime in general." In this way, beat supervision in Maricopa tries to do more than just monitor probationers more closely; it also tries to advance public safety in any way it can.

Now, four years after the storefront probation office opened, members of the Coronado community know they can come there for help. For example, a block watch captain asked the probation officers for help with a campaign to get speed bumps at a dangerous intersection. "We got together as many probationers as we could to go door to door to get petitions signed," Ebratt said.

Community service has changed the way area residents perceive offenders; and it has also given offenders a sense of pride to see the positive impact they can have on their own neighborhood, Ebratt said.

Of course, Coronado's community-based probation officers also learn more about their probationers through closer observation and contact with their families and neighbors. Ebratt recalled a case in which a probation officer got to know the wife of a probationer after several visits to their home. This familiarity gave the wife courage enough to page the officer one day when her husband became verbally abusive toward her. Although the probation officer was ill at the time, he contacted a local community-based police officer with whom he had developed a working relationship. When the police subsequently visited the probationer's home, they discovered that the man had a gun, a violation of his probation. After consulting with the probation officer, it was decided that the man posed a threat to his wife's safety and he was arrested. "By being in the neighborhood and knowing more intimately what's going on with the individual we can intervene when problems arise before those problems develop into new crimes," Ebratt noted.

Boston: Operation Night Light

In May 1992, during the funeral of a reputed gang member at the Morningstar Baptist Church in the Mattapan section of Boston, gunfire broke out and someone was stabbed when members of a rival gang infiltrated the ceremony. The incident, captured on videotape by a local television station, horrified the city, which since the late 1980s had been gripped by an epidemic of gang violence that would peak the following year, with 98 adult and 16 juvenile homicides, according to statistics supplied by the Massachusetts Probation Service. "Things were out of control on the street," recalls Bernard Fitzgerald, Chief Probation Officer for the Dorchester Court. "We weren't enforcing the conditions of probation and we couldn't effectively do it without the cooperation of the police, given the rate of violence."

A few weeks after the Morningstar melee, an Anti-Gang Unit detective named Bob Merner and two probation officers, Bill Stewart and Rick Skinner, talked informally about ways to stop the violence. Research suggested that probationers were responsible for as much as 20 percent of serious crime. Stewart and Skinner thought they could make a dent in this by, among other things, making sure probationers were complying with curfews that were a condition of their sentences. They wanted to "put a little more of a net over [probationers] than we would normally have," explains Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Deputy Commissioner of the Massachusetts Probation Service (now Executive Director of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court).

Probation officers already had the authority to arrest offenders who violated conditions of their probation, but they didn't feel comfortable making arrests because, for one thing, they didn't carry weapons. In a marriage of convenience, they turned to the Police Department for help. And out of that partnership, a new approach to community supervision of probationers was born.

Night Ride

On November 12, 1992, at 8:45 p.m., Stewart, Skinner and two other probation officers joined Detective Merner and two more police officers for their first night ride, with Stewart and Skinner following the crowded police cruiser in Stewart's 1985 Chrysler LeBaron station wagon.

Within five minutes, Stewart recalls, a report of a shooting came across the radio and the police cruiser sped away. By the time the station wagon arrived at the site, the yellow police tape had already been hung, so Stewart and Skinner stayed back. Then Skinner was called inside; the shooting victim, a young man lying on the pavement with a bullet in his chest, was one of his probationers.

Stewart, meanwhile, still watching from outside the tape, spied one of his own probationers among a group of kids standing nearby. By now it was approximately 9:30 p.m., so he walked up to the boy and, surprising him, asked why he wasn't at home, complying with his curfew.

"That's not fair," he says the boy replied. "Probation don't ride in no police car."

Stewart suddenly understood that the boy counted on police and probation not to work together so he could take advantage of the system. "On that statement," he says, "Night Light was born."

Operation Night Light, as it came to be called, was a formal partnership between the Boston Police Department and the Office of the Commissioner of Probation for Massachusetts.

The most obvious advantage of this partnership was that it gave probation officers access to more information about their probationers' lifestyles — information that could help them catch violations, pick up early signals that a probationer may be going astray and make more appropriate and timely referrals to supportive services. Police officers benefit, too. By becoming more familiar with probationers' comings and goings, their favorite hangouts and their associates, police officers have more and better information to work with when developing crime-fighting strategies.

Offering Youth an Alternative

The creators of Operation Night Light understood, however, that getting tougher on crime wasn't by itself enough. "If you're going to do suppression of youth violence, you have to have something to offer as an alternative," explains Fitzgerald. To provide such alternatives, Operation Night Light turned to the community for help.

Historically, Boston's poor and minority communities, where much of the city's violence was concentrated, have been wary of law enforcement personnel. Yet the events at Morningstar had shocked community leaders as much as anyone else, and this gave police and probation officials a rare opportunity to seek common ground with them. The Ten Point Coalition was a consortium of African-American churches — including Morningstar — that had mobilized in response to the gang epidemic. After the incident at Morningstar, the coalition and law enforcement decided to work together.

Mark Scott, Director of the Ella J. Baker House, a social service organization affiliated with the Ten Point Coalition, has been a long-time advocate for youth involved in the courts. Scott still serves as a youth advocate, but the Ella J. Baker House now conducts fatherhood and cultural literacy programs for juvenile probationers in connection with Operation Night Light.

"Initially our relations with the probation officers were antagonistic," Scott says of the days before Operation Night Light. "We viewed them as cops. They viewed us as advocates for bad kids. But over time, we began to understand them as allies." He and his former antagonists now work together to maximize each child's access to guidance and support. "We try to team up with probation officers to put two adults in [the probationer's] life," he explains.

Vermont: Starting with the Public

Between 1984 and 1994, the population of Vermont's state prisons increased by 133 percent. Yet during that same decade prison bed space in the state grew by only 79 percent. Faced with the expensive prospect of building more prisons, Vermont's Department of Corrections began looking for alternative ways to deal with crime.

In what was an unusual decision at that time, the department turned to the public for guidance. In January 1993, it hired John Doble Research Associates Inc., a New York-based research firm, to conduct three, two-hour long focus groups in the cities of Brattleboro, St. Johnsbury and Burlington. In May 1994, it followed up with a statewide telephone survey. The results of this research were startling. Only 37 percent of respondents approved of the state's existing corrections procedure. "We were rated lower than Jimmy Carter was rated at the height of the Iran hostage crisis," recalls John Perry, Director of Planning at the Vermont Department of Corrections. An astonishing 75 percent thought the entire system needed reforming.

According to Perry, people were emphatic about what they wanted in an ideal system: They wanted to be safe from violent predators, they wanted accountability from non-violent offenders, and they favored options that allowed average citizens to participate in the judicial process themselves. When presented with specific proposals, the public was similarly unambiguous. "When we gave them the concept of the reparative board," says Perry, "92 percent thought it was a hell of a good idea."

Reparative boards became more than just a popular idea in 1994, when the state overhauled its entire sentencing structure. Under this new state policy, low-risk non-violent offenders, such as shoplifters, vandals, and check forgers, are given the option of meeting with a reparative board, a group of community volunteers who develop and monitor 90-day probation sentences that require offenders to make up for the harm their actions may have caused.

The Reparative Probation Program is an alternative to regular probation, which in Vermont "can be pretty onerous," sometimes, albeit rarely, lasting a lifetime, Perry said. Those who participate avoid regular probation if they successfully complete what the board asks them to do within 90 days.

Repairing the Damage

Reparative boards usually have three to six members at any given session, and usually meet on a weekly or biweekly basis. Sessions, which can last anywhere from 30 minutes to two hours for the most complicated cases, are open to the public, and friends or relatives of the victim and the offender are encouraged to attend. If the victim is present, he or she has an opportunity to talk about the impact the crime has had on his or her life. The offender then tells his or her side of the story. Board members ask questions, talk about how the offense has hurt the community at large and negotiate a contract that describes steps the offender must take to repair the harm caused by the offense.

"The theory is offenders have offended us and they owe us a debt. And the way they repay the debt is not by costing us tax dollars, but repaying the debt, by fixing what was broken, restoring what was damaged," Perry says.

Barbara Leslie, coordinator of three reparative boards in Burlington, Vermont, offered the example of a 24-year-old woman who appeared before a panel for stealing three checks worth about \$800. "When she came to us, we found out she was in an abusive relationship, in the middle of getting a divorce, and she had issues with substance abuse she was denying," Leslie says. The board had her write a letter of apology to the victim and, because she was un-employed and didn't have money, ordered her to perform extra hours of community service in lieu of paying back the \$800 — but only after the victim okayed the terms.

"We try to put the victims at the center of everything and ask the offenders to spend a fair amount of time thinking about the victims," Leslie says.

From Wreck to Reparation

Alan Taplow, a retired purchasing manager who sits on a reparative board in Barre, Vermont, described the case of a young man who, after being evicted from a party at about 3 a.m., drove his car into a trash hauling bin, knocking over a propane gas tank and creating a dangerous, potentially explosive situation. He was rescued from the wreck by two police officers, charged with driving under the influence, and, in addition to receiving various fines, given the option of participating in a reparative board. The contract he worked out with the board included the following:

- To understand the impact of his crime, the man was asked to research and write at least five pages of reflections on the

experience, including what he learned about police work relating to drunken driving and the work of the Fire Department in similar emergency situations.

- To make amends to the victims, he agreed to write letters of apology to the Police and Fire Department personnel directly involved in and endangered by the incident. He was also asked to write letters to the people evacuated from their homes while the propane was being cleared.
- For community service, the man, a landscape designer and stone worker, was required to work with town selectmen to plan and implement a project to beautify the village square.
- Finally, to learn ways not to re-offend, he agreed to undergo alcohol assessment and comply with any resulting recommendations for treatment.

The young man reappeared in front of the board three months later, having completed all of his contract save for the landscape project. Because the ground was too cold, the board granted him an extension until spring.

Reparative boards now handle more than 30 percent of the state's probation case load, with at least 350 citizens on more than 50 boards throughout the state. "We have towns demanding that they get a board," Perry says. "We are expanding as fast as we can."

With the creation of the reparative boards, the state's probation officers' jobs also changed. In addition to supervising directly those offenders who don't go through the boards, they support the reparative boards in a variety of ways: helping track down victims, building a referral network for offenders and coordinating communication between the boards and the court. Officers are also expected to meet with the community to cultivate support for and involvement in the reparative boards.

In theory, with the boards' supervising so many low-level offenders, probation officers should have more time to focus on high-risk cases involving felony or violent offenders. But that hasn't happened yet. While the reparative boards are siphoning off some of the work normally performed by probation officers, the officers' regular caseloads continue to rise. Niel Christiansen, corrections services manager for the Burlington Court Reparative Services Office, said that due to the increasing popularity of probation as a sanction, the caseloads of officers on his staff have doubled to about 200 over the last five years, thus keeping probation officers as busy as ever. And yet, while many probation officers are still frustrated with their heavy caseloads, many are also deriving new satisfaction from working more closely with community and victims. "When you're working only with one party to a situation, you tend to hear that perspective. Reaching out to victims helps balance it, and that's a good thing," Christiansen said.

Deschutes County: Reinventing a Department

Deschutes County, near the center of the state of Oregon, is one of the fastest growing counties in the United States. Not long ago, loggers and environmentalists sparred here over the fate of the spotted owl. Now the region's rural past is giving way to an increasingly urban future. Deschutes County today is home to burgeoning high-tech and service industries; yet it is still not uncommon for children living on area farms to shoot sage rats as part of their morning chores before heading off to school.

Given these conditions, the county's decision to integrate community-based probation into a comprehensive redesign of its judicial services was a preemptive one. "[The change] was not problem centered," recalls Dennis Maloney, Director of the Deschutes County Department of Community Justice. "It was, I would call it, foresight centered."

Maloney, an advocate of restorative justice, a philosophy that emphasizes repairing the damage done by crime to individual victims and communities, was speaking on a panel in Washington, D.C., in 1996 when he was invited to lunch by U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno, who was attending the event. During the meal, the attorney general expressed an interest in restorative justice, but was troubled by its purely reactive stance. "Shouldn't we have a national crime policy that calls for as much emphasis on prevention?" Maloney says she asked him. She then proposed a slightly revised concept: community justice, which combines restorative justice with community development efforts aimed at crime prevention.

Several months later, Deschutes County received a grant from the National Institute of Corrections to create a pilot community justice program. State laws tied the county's hands in making changes to its adult probation program. But its juvenile division was radically restructured. Under the new system, juvenile probation officers were reassigned into three teams: the Accountability Team, which interacts with offenders and the courts, the Community Outreach Team, which works with the community to develop service projects for both probationers and at-risk youth, and the Restoration Team, which offers mediation in lieu of court for low-level offenses and also tries to ensure that offenders pay back their victims for the harm they've done.

Within this new model, many of the traditional boundaries of probation fell away and probation officers, now renamed "community justice officers," began treating juvenile probation as part of a larger effort to eliminate crime before it began. No longer would they be simply probation supervisors; they were now community problem-solvers and probation was but one of their tools.

Community-based probation was integrated throughout the new system in a variety of ways. The Restoration Team, for example, drafts agreements between offenders and victims requiring offenders to make up for their actions by, say, working for their victims until any cost incurred as a result of the offense has been reimbursed. Offenders on probation may be assigned to the Restorative Community Work Service, which requires them to work on projects that the Community Outreach Team and the local stakeholders have jointly developed; these community service projects — like helping build a house for a low-income family — are designed both to pay back the community as well as give offenders a sense of accomplishment. In some cases, offenders may even be eligible for a program called Fresh Start, which pays them a minimum wage (\$6.50 in Oregon) until they earn enough to repay their crime victim.

Prevention Projects

"The best way to work with crime in the community is to work on prevention projects," says Ken Mathers, a ten-year veteran of Deschutes County's Juvenile Probation Department and now team leader of the Community Outreach Team. "The

second part of the job is working with offenders and connecting them with the community."

An example of how Mathers combines both approaches occurred in the summer of 1999 when the Community Outreach Team organized a fundraiser to sustain a popular summer music and food festival in the city of Bend called Munch & Music. "One person from their board came to our department and said 'This is drug and alcohol free, and we believe it's crime prevention. Can you help us out?'" recalls Mathers, explaining how a former probation officer became involved in such an unusual project. After agreeing that it would benefit the community, the Outreach Team recruited over 100 volunteers, including 50 kids — of whom only a few were from the corrections system — to do everything from selling tickets and distributing food to performing for the audience. A group from the Youth Investment Program, a four-month incarcerative program, even performed a play at the event. "These are kids who are sort of the thugs around town, and here they're dressed up in drama gear," says Mathers. "Several months ago people would say these kids are thugs, now what they're saying is that these kids have some amazing skills."

Projects such as the Munch & Music fundraiser illustrate how Deschutes County's community justice officers have moved beyond simply trying to monitor offender behavior to prevent criminal behavior in the first place. By working with the community to create meaningful activities for both offenders and kids at risk of offending, they are working to provide alternatives to criminal activity. "Crime prevention occurs whenever we can connect a kid with a community," says Mathers. "The more connected kids are, the more preventative that is."

Measuring Success

As the four probation departments described in this paper continue their on-going experiments with community justice, they are struggling with ways to measure the effectiveness of their programs.

In Boston, Operation Night Light, which was eventually extended to adult as well as juvenile probation, has pointed to significant drops in local crime. While Operation Night Light cannot by itself be credited with this success because it was not the only anti-crime initiative undertaken in Boston during the 1990s, the numbers are impressive. However, there were only 31 fatalities in the city in 1999, only one of which involved a victim 16 and under. In that same year, according to Fitzgerald, the city saw only 8,636 criminal complaints compared to previous annual rates of anywhere from 12,000 to 15,000.

Maricopa County has also produced some encouraging numbers. Among Coronado probationers ordered to do community service, 71 percent complied, compared to only 28 percent in a comparison group, said Leslie Ebratt, the adult probation officer supervisor in Maricopa County. Likewise, 70 percent of Coronado offenders who owed restitution to victims made payments, compared to only 44 percent in the comparison group.

Vermont uses public opinion as a measure of its success. The state continues to poll citizen satisfaction with the corrections system and it is beginning to see evidence that that satisfaction is rising. From the 1994 low of only 37 percent approval for the system, the number of positive assessments of the state's corrections system risen to 44 percent — a small but encouraging sign of changing public perceptions, according to Perry, the

state Corrections Department's director of planning. Also, compliance with board-imposed sanctions has been at nearly 85 percent.

Meanwhile, Deschutes County has tracked the responses of offenders to their new programs. "A lot of community work service is really kind of mundane activity," Maloney said. "Offenders don't like that kind of work. They think it's demeaning and they know that there's not much value to it. But when you have them build child abuse centers, parks, things of very high value, offenders show up at a high rate. And they will often work longer than ordered."

The enthusiasm expressed by "Brian," a young man who spent four months in Deschutes County's Youth Investment Program, working every other week to build a house with Habitat for Humanity, supports Maloney's assertion. "It was a great feeling knowing that we were helping these people," he says. "It was kind of a way to pay back for the things we had done and at the same time give us a feeling of respect." That serious crime among juvenile offenders like Brian has fallen 27 percent in the two years since Deschutes County's new program was launched further supports this impression.

Job satisfaction among probation officers is also an important indicator. "I used to measure a good week's progress by how many files I processed," recalls Mathers of Deschutes County, who confesses that he was pursuing a career change before the department overhaul. "You'd always stack your files up as you finished them and say 'I'm done with that,' almost like a brick layer. With [the new system], the measurement's completely different. We may get a call from a citizen we don't even remember meeting and they're complimenting us on how we're working with youth or how we've beautified an area. That type of reward far surpasses stacking up the files."

Obstacles

Large organizations, and government agencies in particular, tend to be resistant to change. Thus it should come as no surprise that planners in Boston, Deschutes County, Maricopa County, and Vermont encountered obstacles as they tried to implement their experimental programs.

"The biggest obstacle that we met was people's shackling to tradition," recalls Maloney of Deschutes County. He points out that many of the people who had trouble giving up the old ways couldn't explain why they should be retained.

Vermont encountered challenges in several areas. Defense attorneys, for example, initially discouraged their clients from submitting to the reparative boards because of the unpredictable nature of each individual board. "A defense lawyer's job is to get the best deal he can for his client, so what they want to do is nail down the deal," explained Perry. "The whole point of the reparative board is you don't know what's going to happen because the community is going to figure it out." This resistance was eventually overcome by experience, as Vermont's defense attorneys discovered that in practice the reparative boards were not unduly onerous on their clients.

Another obstacle they faced in Vermont was the reluctance of some community volunteers to bring victims into the process. Leslie said that in her area it's been "challenging" finding enough volunteers to do victim outreach because of the complex emotions involved. "People don't like to deal with victims," she said.

One of Operation Night Light's major challenges was to overcome distrust between Boston's probation officers and police, who were accustomed to working separately and inclined to protect their "turf." "It was a new way of doing business at first, and many of our officers were skeptical," recalls Corbett.

In Oregon, the Department of Community Justice fostered public support through a media campaign that showed offenders working on community service projects. "The media and the public never cared about what went on in my office," one officer told Maloney after the officer had organized juvenile probationers to build bunk beds for poor families and color photographs of the work had appeared in the local paper. "Now we're getting cheered."

The power of public opinion was evident in Boston, too. "The pioneers got such good press that it didn't take too long to get a lot more people involved," says Corbett. Today, Operation Night Light is so well accepted that incentives for officers to work nights and weekends have been written into the Probation Department's contract and nearly 45 percent of the work force have signed up to participate. Says Corbett, "The change has taken root and is part of the DNA of the organization now."

Resources

Given the early results and public acclaim that these community justice experiments have generated, many probation departments across the country are eager to pursue change. At the same time, many complain that they simply don't have enough money to experiment.

Vermont, Deschutes County, and Maricopa County relied on outside grants to kick start their programs, but the simple fact is that probation has been underfunded for decades and there's no reason to think the situation will soon change. The problem is, in part, probation's lousy reputation. "Probation gets funded exceptionally poorly, so it can't possibly do the job it's supposed to do; so then legislators say, 'You're not doing your job right, so why should we give you more money?'" Jacobson says. "Another problem is that prison and the death penalty dominate the debate about crime in this country, even though twice as many people are on probation. People just don't want to talk about probation. There's periodically talk in the field about abandoning the word 'probation' because it has such a negative connotation."

Faced with such a grim funding picture, it's clear that probation departments can't depend on an influx of new cash to pay for innovation. They will have to find a way to make adjustments with the resources they have. There is some good news, however: some experimental probation programs have been able to offset higher costs through new efficiencies.

In Coronado, for example, community-based probation officers have been able to maintain the same caseload, approximately 60 per officer, as the county's traditional probation officers. This is possible, says Ebratt, because the time community-based staff save by not driving to remote areas can be applied to their new responsibilities. After Operation Night Light was established in Boston, probationer behavior improved, allowing probation officers there to become more efficient as well, according to Bill Stewart. In the early days, he says by way of example, probation officers went into the field three times a week. Now they have to go only once a week.

Oregon has looked for creative solutions to help pay for the cost of adding crime prevention to its probation officers' responsibilities. For its Youth Investment Program, for example, a four month incarceration program followed by at least six months of "aftercare," the county negotiated an agreement with the state granting it the equivalent of what it would cost to house the offenders in a state facility. Half of that money is earmarked for youth-crime prevention.

Perhaps the most cost-efficient thing about the Vermont program is that the boards are staffed by community volunteers. "Our idea," says Lynne Walther, a restorative justice consultant who helped design the Reparative Boards, "is that the community will do most of the time-consuming work."

Each of these programs' experience suggests that financial considerations need not be an obstacle to launching a problem-solving experiment. Moreover, some are optimistic that community-based probation will ultimately attract more money as it proves, over time, its effectiveness.

Conclusion

The willingness of probation leaders to admit that probation needs an overhaul has spawned innovation and experimentation — with or without increased financial support or resources. As the four programs profiled above demonstrate, change is in the air.

But much more can be done. These four experiments affect only a small fraction of the nearly four million people on probation. And while the task of reforming probation may seem daunting, the potential rewards are vast. As members of John DiIulio's task force wrote, "probation is at once the most troubled and the most promising part of America's criminal justice system."

Probation's promise is in its potential to reach millions of offenders and keep them on the path of reform; to strengthen communities by involving ordinary citizens in the supervision and rehabilitation of probationers in their midst; to partner with a broad array of agencies in and out of the criminal justice system; and to experiment with new ways of solving problems. Whether it's called "community-focused probation," "problem-solving probation" or "broken-windows probation," these new approaches have the potential to reverse the public's negative impression of probation and have a far-reaching impact on crime rates and a community's sense of safety — and ultimately, help probation live up to the vision laid down by John Augustus so many years ago.

SUCCESSFUL SUPERVISION STRATEGY FOR THE REINVENTION OF PROBATION

by

Lawrence F. Tinsley

Director

Bell/Lampasas Counties Community Supervision
and Corrections Department
Belton, Texas

A successful supervision strategy for addressing the problems of probationers is an essential component in the implementation of the "broken windows" model for the reinvention of probation. The "broken windows" model holds as its central tenet that the primary mission of probation is the protection of the public. It also propounds that the security needs of a given community should be identified by its residents and that probation departments, in turn, should respond to these identified needs. Finally, the "broken windows" model states that in order for probation to be effective, supervision officers must devote the bulk of their time in the places where offenders live, work, and recreate and that probation departments should draw heavily from community resources.¹

Despite the shift in focus from office reporting to field contacts that the "broken windows" approach to the reinvention of probation demands, quality supervision is still vital for ensuring the effective delivery of court mandated or department provided programs and services. Quality supervision is the primary instrument for changing offender behavior and reducing recidivism. It is necessary in order to achieve a reduction in the number of probationers being sent to prison for technical revocations. Finally, quality supervision is the key for redirecting offenders toward more socially acceptable activities and for enabling them to be fully reintegrated into their local communities.

For the last several years the Bell/Lampasas Counties Community Supervision and Corrections Department (CSCD) in Texas has fully embraced the "broken windows" model for the reinvention of probation. By all indications the adoption of this model in this medium-sized jurisdiction in Central Texas has proven to fulfill the twin objectives of enhancing public protection and increasing the number of offenders who successfully complete the term of their community supervision. Nevertheless the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD has also determined that in order to wholly implement this new approach to community supervision, it is necessary for the department to identify and for its officers to utilize quality supervision strategies.

The Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD has learned that effective supervision strategies consist of several basic and interrelated elements. In order to properly address offender behavior, it is critical that the individual be correctly assessed regarding his/her risk to the community, that the needs (deficiencies) of the individual that contributed to the commission of the criminal offense be accurately identified, that the supervision officer formulate a comprehensive plan for allocating resources in proportion to the risk level indicated for the offender and for targeting services that meet the needs of the offender, that the

progress (or lack thereof) of the offender be regularly gauged, and that the officer utilize proper supervision (interview) techniques. In addition, chronological reports need to adequately include all the above mentioned elements in order that managers can monitor and audit the quality of the officer's supervision. Finally, in order to successfully supervise high and medium risk probationers, it is necessary for the officer to have sufficient time to work with the offender and to visit the offender in his/her environment.

Risk and Needs Assessment

Before an effective supervision strategy can be formulated for any probationer, it is necessary to determine the risk and needs of the offender. A risk and needs instrument should be administered to all offenders, both felons and misdemeanants. Currently, the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD, as well as other community supervision and corrections departments throughout the State of Texas, use the Wisconsin model for determining the risk and needs of offenders. This instrument provides a structured interview process for ascertaining the risk and needs of offenders.² By and large, most practitioners in the field of community corrections in this State, including officers and supervisors within the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD, are satisfied with the validity and ease of the risk and needs instrument now being used.

Strategies for Case Supervision (SCS)

There is also general agreement among practitioners in the State of Texas that a uniform strategies instrument should be utilized throughout the State. In Texas the recognized case management instrument is the Strategies for Case Supervision (SCS). This instrument classifies an offender into one of five categories: (1) Casework Control³; (2) Environmental Structure⁴; (3) Limit Setting (LS)⁵; (4) Selective Intervention — Situational (SI-S)⁶; and (5) Selective Intervention — Treatment (SI-T)⁷. The classification of the offender guides the officer in identifying the problems to address and the type of supervision that the officer will employ. Although the reliability of the SCS has been questioned in some academic circles, it remains the best instrument in North America for developing supervision approaches for offenders on community supervision.

Although the oversight agency for community supervision and corrections departments in the State of Texas requires that the SCS be administered on all felons determined to be at a risk level one or two, the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD firmly maintains that it is advantageous to apply the SCS to level three

felons and misdemeanants with a high risk level. Unfortunately the administering of the SCS involves a forty-five minute interview by a supervision officer and the scoring and analysis of the instrument takes an additional one and one-half hours. Thus, if an officer's caseload exceeds 100 cases, it is almost impossible to administer the SCS to all probationers who would benefit from a supervision plan based on a case management instrument.

The lack of the application of the SCS instrument state-wide to all suitable offenders is one reason for the increase in the state revocation rate for technical violators and for the cause of the overcrowding problems that Texas prisons have recently experienced. The simple fact is that many probationers in this State are not receiving the right supervision. The Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD has managed to administer the SCS to all its felony probationers and all high risk misdemeanor probationers by making this a high priority within the department, by developing "balloon" case loads that allow a single officer to maintain a large case load consisting of low risk misdemeanor offenders and thus reduce the size of the case loads for other officers, and by having support staff perform certain activities, such as gathering and preparing court documents and administering non-SCS assessments, that had previously been performed by supervision officers.

Other Assessment Instruments

The Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD has further found that it should consider the utilization of other assessment instruments to better formulate supervision plans for offenders. These assessment instruments should complement the SCS and not be used as a substitute for the SCS. Assessment instruments are regularly used for probationers on specialized caseloads, i.e., alcohol and substance abuse cases and sex offender cases. In addition certain assessment instruments should be used to determine the educational level of an offender or whether the offender has a learning disability that would hinder his/her participation in certain programs and services, determine vocational skills or the aptitude of an offender, assess the social or family dynamics of the offender, or evaluate the psychological status of an offender or measure the coping skills of the person. Despite the advantage of using these various assessment instruments, the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD readily acknowledges that for many departments they can be prohibitively costly and they also can require a great deal of time to be administered.

Supervision Plans

The heart of an effective supervision strategy is a comprehensive supervision plan. It is the plan that drives the supervision process. The purpose of any plan is to address the criminogenic needs of the offender. Supervision plans should address two primary areas of concern: risk management and risk reduction. Risk management provides effective supervision for those persons who are highly likely to recidivate. Risk management also directs that limited departmental resources be expended primarily on those probationers who pose the greatest potential risk to a community. Risk reduction addresses the areas of needs in an offender's life that are likely to contribute to the person's risk level.

The Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD has found that certain components must be included in all supervision plans of both misdemeanor and felony probationers. There must be separate sections that address the risk management and risk reduction of the offender. Risk levels must also be identified. The officer preparing the supervision plan must determine how often an offender will be visited at his/her home or elsewhere. In addition, the supervision plan must identify the problem areas (or criminogenic needs) of the offender.

Once the problem areas are identified, then action stages must be developed to address deficiencies in the offender's life. Each action stage has to contain the following:

- a) a statement of the behavioral objectives to be achieved;
- b) a statement of the specific task to be accomplished in order to achieve the objective;
- c) a statement of a specific time-frame for each task to be accomplished; and
- d) a statement of the supervision strategy, i.e., techniques appropriate for achieving behavioral objectives and verifying actions taken by the offender or performed by the officer.

In addition the areas addressing the criminogenic needs may need to be prioritized. It may be inappropriate or detrimental for an offender to concentrate on two or more areas at the same time. Finally, a supervision plan should contain a cognitive referral if the officer deems it appropriate and the offender is a suitable candidate for cognitive counseling.

Supervision of Offenders

It is the utilization of new supervision practices that will primarily increase the diversions from prison, decrease the technical revocation rate, and change offender behavior. It is the position of the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD that the supervision practice that holds the optimum degree of successfully achieving the above stated goals incorporates a cognitive model in the delivery of programs and services for probationers. The cognitive model addresses the anti-social behavior and anti-social peer influences of offenders. These two factors are the single greatest contributors to criminal behavior but are also the most amenable to modification through cognitive self-change.

While there are numerous cognitive programs available to adult probation departments in this country, the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD maintains that a good cognitive program must contain three elements. The program must have a cognitive restructuring element in order to address criminal thinking patterns. It must also have a cognitive social skills training element in order to teach pro-social skills and behavior. Finally, it must have a life skills program. For residential cognitive programs, it is also highly recommended that a family program be offered.

Cognitive programs can be administered in one of two ways. Under one way, all of the officers in a probation department can be instructed in the basic principles of the cognitive model and apply these principles to all offenders as part of the regular supervision process. Moreover, certain high risk offenders can be referred to cognitive group counseling sessions. This is the primary way that cognitive programs are administered in the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD.

In addition, the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD also uses a second way for administering cognitive/behavioral programs. Under this second approach, the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD initially selects, for participation in cognitive group counseling sessions, certain medium or high risk offenders either within a residential or non-residential setting who are deemed suitable for a cognitive program. Under this second approach, the group counseling sessions consist of 12-15 persons. Attendance in these group sessions is mandatory. These counseling sessions also entail intense surveillance of the offender.

Upon completion of these group sessions, the offenders then participate in an after care program. For the highest risk offenders, this after care consists of group sessions, followed by other interventions that address other criminogenic needs of this offender population, e.g., substance abuse treatment with a cognitive theoretical basis, and by supervision that re-enforces what the offenders have learned in the group. For less risky offenders the after care consists of exposure to cognitive principles through normal supervision.

The Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD's cognitive programs have been greatly influenced by the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) cognitive program called "Thinking for a Change". In this particular cognitive program up-front counseling consists of 22 lessons. These sessions last for up to one and one-half hours each and can be held once or twice a week for twenty-two weeks. Upon completion of the up-front counseling, there is another four weeks of after care counseling sessions held once a week. These two components last a minimum of three months. The techniques of these counseling sessions consist of thinking reports to expose criminal or risky thinking, modeling of pro-social behavior, role playing, and homework. The closer these counseling sessions relate these techniques to real life experiences, the better the quality of the program.

In most cognitive programs, it is recommended that counseling sessions be "closed," i.e., that the group accept no new members once the counseling sessions begin, in order that the participants may learn sequentially. However, the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD recognizes that there are some programs (Moral Reconciliation Therapy) that allow "open" sessions, i.e., ones that continually receive new members during the course of the program. These programs are acceptable if they have a skills component.

Nevertheless, the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD firmly maintains that any cognitive based program must consist of exposing anti-social thinking and also replacing that thinking with pro-social alternatives. Moreover, regardless of the type of cognitive program utilized, it is necessary for the program to be monitored monthly and for monthly meetings to be conducted for quality control, clinical supervision, and process evaluation. In addition, any ancillary programs and services to which a participant in a cognitive program is referred must be compatible with the cognitive model.

It is widely understood that there are only certain types of offenders who are suitable candidates for referral to a cognitive group counseling program. These are high risk offenders, i.e., those with a felony risk level of one, two, or three or a misdemeanor high risk level, adolescent offenders, and substance abuse offenders. Poor or unsuitable candidates for a group counseling program are low risk offenders, offenders with low IQs or mental instability, and offenders classified by the SCS as environmental structuring.

After an offender has participated in cognitive group counseling sessions and an after care program in the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD, a supervision officer must continually reaffirm the thinking techniques that the offender learned in the cognitive counseling sessions. A supervision officer does this by using certain interviewing techniques in order to ascertain whether the offender is reverting to criminal thinking. If the offender is engaged in anti-social thinking, then the officer may request that the offender prepare either a written or an oral thinking report. The officer may also use the thinking reports to gauge changes in the offender's criminal thinking patterns. Finally it is necessary for an officer to model pro-social behavior. A supervision officer must show the offender that he/she follows the same practices for handling problems as were taught to the offender in the group sessions. For this reason, it is important that everyone in the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD understand the concepts of pro-social thinking and cognitive self-change and practice the techniques.

Another significant supervision strategy goal is to shift the supervision of offenders from an office setting to the field. It is the goal of Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD to eventually have its officers devote 65 to 75 percent of their time doing field visits. These field visits consist of curfew checks, home visits, and collateral contacts and generally are conducted during non-traditional work hours. Field visits enable the officer to evaluate the progress of an offender in his/her own environment. It reassures communities and neighborhoods that supervision officers are aware of what is occurring in their localities. Finally, field visits enable officers to link offender needs with community ties and services.

A third important supervision strategy goal, besides following a cognitive model and conducting field visits, is to develop local resources to enable offenders to successfully complete the term of their community supervision. As previously noted, one of the more significant factors in criminal behavior is the existence of negative peer influences. Thus it is necessary to develop community resources where an offender spends his/her time in order to replace negative influences with more positive ones.

Moreover, community resources enable the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD to develop partnerships with persons and organizations that readily understand the background of the offender and can relate to the culture and circumstances of the offender. In addition, faith-based initiatives can provide positive support measures to deter probationers from reoffending. Finally, in order to more efficiently utilize public resources the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD recognizes that it must network with government agencies, such as mental health agencies, employment referral and vocational agencies, and substance abuse treatment organizations and with private social service agencies, to address the problems of offenders and their families.

Documentation (Chronological Entries)

It cannot be stressed enough how important good documentation is to the effective supervision of an offender. Timely documentation forces an officer to refer to the supervision plan and evaluate the supervision strategy, it provides continuity whenever another officer assumes the responsibility for supervising the offender, and it allows supervisors to evaluate the quality of

the supervision being provided by officers. Documentation at a minimum must accurately and regularly verify compliance with the conditions of community supervision imposed by the court; reflect any changes in the status of an offender, e.g., change in address, employment, marital state; indicate that the officer took appropriate actions for a violation of the conditions of community supervision; and indicate that the officer is using a cognitive approach to supervision.

Essential to any good documentation is the need to address the criminogenic needs listed in the supervision plan. It is vital that the officer indicate that his/her supervision strategies are based on the information contained in the supervision plan. In the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD, the case files for the probationers are designed so that when the officer opens a file, the supervision plan and the chronological entries appear opposite each other, thus buttressing the idea that the officer must continuously refer to the supervision plan when interviewing the offender and make chronological notations that address the problems and needs found in the supervision plan.

Moreover, monitors or auditors for the department look for "markers" in the documentation that show that the officer understands the concept of and reinforces pro-social thinking and cognitive self-change. One such marker for which auditors look is a notation concerning whether an offender is engaging in anti-social or criminal thinking. A followup marker indicates whether the officer is using cognitive skills that enable the offender to recognize his anti-social thinking patterns. Another marker indicates whether the supervision officer is actively engaging in a conversation with the offender that solicits pertinent information related to understanding and assessing the needs or risks of the offender or whether the officer is merely going through the perfunctory motions of accommodating the reporting requirements of the offender.

Responsivity Assessments

The Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD has determined that the greatest existing deficiency in the provision of quality supervision of offenders is the lack of an assessment instrument that measures the progress of an offender under supervision. Responsivity determines whether the offender is positively or negatively responding to supervision or the programs and services offered to the offender. Such an instrument must measure change in the offender's circumstances; therefore, it must be a dynamic instrument and not a static one. Hence, the indicators to be measured must be subject to change and not be historical facts.

Among the academics currently undertaking the development of a responsivity instrument to measure change in an offender's circumstances or behavior, there is a debate concerning whether the proper model should be based on a sociological or psychological approach. A sociological model would measure such factors as the education level of the offender, the vocational or job skills of the individual, consider the gender, age, and race of the person, and include the socio-economic background of the probationer. A psychological model would determine whether the offender is a committed criminal, a situational criminal, suffers from neurotic anxieties, or has a character disorder. The indicators in a psychological model would measure such factors as job stability, marital/family relations,

substance abuse, community functioning, financial concerns, emotional needs, and the attitude of the offender.

While this article does not question the validity of either model, for purposes of implementing the "broken windows" model for the reinvention of probation, the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD has found that a psychological assessment model is preferable for development for several reasons. One, psychological determinants of an offender are more subject to change than sociological ones which rely on several historical or endemic factors. Moreover, psychological determinants are more amenable to "treatment" in the criminal justice system than sociological ones. This is because sociological factors are deeply rooted in the general structure of our society. Solutions to societal ills require a commitment from social and political agencies to address problems that extend beyond the focus and purpose of the criminal justice components. Psychological determinants, being more individualistic, are therefore more amenable to being successfully addressed by criminal justice agencies.

Although instruments measuring change in an offender's circumstances or behavior are used in some jurisdictions in the United States and are widely utilized in Canada, very few community supervision and corrections departments in Texas use such an instrument. Because of the expense in utilizing existing responsivity instruments and the unavailability of a state-funded instrument, the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD has developed its own instrument, which it is presently administering on an experimental basis. While this instrument has yet to be found to be reliable⁸ and to be validated,⁹ it is undergoing academic review and supervision officers within the department have found that the information collected from the instrument is useful.

It is the hope of the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD that the regular use of this responsivity instrument will not only indicate whether the supervision strategy utilized for a particular probationer has been correctly diagnosed or delivered but will also save resources that otherwise would have been expended for a considerable period of time on an incorrect supervision strategy. As such this department is administering its responsivity instrument to all high and medium risk felons every six months and to all high risk misdemeanants every three months. Presently, the department is conducting an internal audit to gauge the progress of probationers under its supervision by comparing originally administered responsivity instruments with subsequently administered instruments.

Conclusion

Through effective supervision strategies, adult probation departments can significantly alleviate the need to increase prison capacity and expand the opportunities for offenders to successfully complete the terms of their probation. In addition adult probation departments can also substantially increase the safety to the public. The Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD strongly believes that the best means for achieving these goals is the utilization of the "broken windows" model for the reinvention of probation. Nevertheless, the Bell/Lampasas Counties CSCD equally believes that in order to fully realize the benefits of "broken windows" probation, quality supervision strategies must be identified and implemented by adult probation departments.

¹ See "Broken Windows" Probation: The Next Step in Fighting Crime, by Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., et al. Civic Report No. 7. New York, New York: The Manhattan Institute, August 1999. See also Transforming Probation Through Leadership: The "Broken Windows" Model, by Ronald L. Corbett, Jr., et al. New York, New York: Center for Civic Innovation at the Manhattan Institute, 2000.

² The Wisconsin instrument scores offenders as maximum, medium, or minimum on its risk and needs scales. The standards of the Texas oversight authority for community supervision and corrections departments in this State, however, require offenders to be placed in one of four levels, with Level 1 being the most intense level of supervision (often classified as residential) to Level 4, for the least amount of supervision.

³ The Casework/Control group primarily demonstrates instability in interpersonal relationships, employment, finances, mental status, and residence. In addition, these types of offenders may manifest depression and/or chemical abuse, as well as difficulties coping with authority figures.

⁴ The Environmental Structure group lacks adequate social, vocational, survival, and often intellectual skills. This group of offenders also demonstrates a lack of foresight, insight, and

hindsight and consequently exhibits high levels of impulsivity. ⁵ The Limit Setting group possesses a strong criminal values orientation and views success in criminal activity as its primary goal.

⁶ The Situational Intervention — Situational group has pro-social values and lifestyles, stability in most areas of existence, and has minimum contact with the legal system. Offenders in this group have generally committed a criminal offense for the first time and their criminal involvement is driven by isolated circumstances or a relatively specific neurotic problem.

⁷ The Situational Intervention — Treatment group of offenders usually has a sexual offense history, history of assaultive behavior, serious chemical abuse, or serious emotional disturbance. However, this group of offenders also exhibits basically pro-social values.

⁸ Reliability ensures that the measurements are consistent, i.e., that two persons in similar circumstances would get the same rating.

⁹ Validity, which is contingent upon the reliability of an instrument, accurately measures what one intends to measure, e.g., that the risk of an individual is accurately tied to recidivism.

NAPE

NAPE EVENTS SCHEDULED FOR ST. PAUL

Make plans to attend the annual NAPE functions in St. Paul, Minnesota, in connection with the Annual Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association.

On the afternoon of Saturday, August 25, 2001, there will be the traditional NAPE Members Reception.

On the morning of Sunday, August 26, 2001, the Annual Awards Breakfast will be held, during which the NAPE Executive of the Year will be presented with the Sam Houston State University Award. This year's recipient is Cheryl K. Townsend, Director of Juvenile Court Services for Maricopa County, Arizona.

Following the Awards Breakfast, the NAPE Board of Directors will meet to conduct the Association's business.

Additional information will be forthcoming.

PROBATION IN A CHANGING EUROPE

by

Donald G. Evans
President
Canadian Training Institute
Toronto, Ontario



The Conference Permanente Europeenne De La Probation (CEP) held its 7th General Assembly and International Symposium in Malta from March 28 to April 1, 2001. The symposium theme addressed the issue of developments in probation in Europe and the role of community sanctions and measures in the criminal justice systems of the countries represented in the CEP. The opening session featured the Minister for Home Affairs of Malta, Dr. Tonio Borg, who outlined the development of probation in Malta and discussed his country's efforts in an expanded use of probation. In responding to Dr. Borg, Martin Tansey, President of CEP, noted that a quality service takes time to plan and develop and that Malta's start in the mid 1990s, with the first group of qualified probation officer graduates from the University of Malta, was a solid foundation on which to build. It is, he said, these highly motivated officers who will demonstrate that probation, as a sanction, is a credible and effective non-custodial sanction.

The next speaker, Professor Anton van Kalmthout of the Netherlands, discussed the problems relating to the transfer of community sanctions and measures in Europe. When offenders from other European countries run afoul of the law when visiting or working in a country other than their own, they are more likely to be given prison sentences even though they would have received community penalties for similar offenses in their own country. There is no agreed upon mechanism for the transfer of community sanctions between states in Europe although there is a formal mechanism for the transfer of prisoners. Prof. Kalmthout argued for the development of protocols between the member states of Europe to facilitate the dispensing of community penalties instead of prison terms and a transfer of the offender to his or her own country.

The next session presented a judicial perspective on probation and was followed by an international panel of discussants. Some key themes that emerged from this discussion were:

- The public doesn't recognize the harm caused by the over-use of imprisonment.
- The increased interest in and use of restorative justice principles in court decisions.
- Criminal law must be linked to and in keeping with the social welfare system.
- Prison has become a reservoir of lawbreakers and our emphasis should be on ensuring that offender's don't re-offend.
- The responsibility of the offender is a key element in their reintegration but they may need assistance to live responsibly!
- Ensuring the offender's participation in programs designed to assist them in their reintegrative task is a major challenge for probation.

- The need to find sources of crime reduction that provide for social inclusion rather than exclusion of the offender.

The afternoon session of the symposium dealt with developments in Europe especially in, Romania, Portugal, the Czech Republic, England and Wales. This session was particularly exciting as it portrayed the differences between those countries which have a long and established history of probation, such as England and Wales, and the new emerging democracies of Europe, as in the case of Romania and the Czech Republic. There was a call for CEP to support Central and Eastern Europe to realize their vision of a fully established probation service and also to support the revision of probation efforts underway in other member states.

Dr. Tapio Lappi-Seppala of Finland delivered the closing address, during which he presented his research on the role of community service sanctions in the reduction of Finland's prison population. Prior to the introduction of community service sanctions, Finland's prison population was the highest of the Nordic states, surpassing Denmark and Sweden.

The General Assembly of CEP was conducted with President Martin Tansey as the chair. In his opening remarks he commented on the work of CEP and the committee reports that have helped to shape probation in Europe. Tansey stressed the need to encourage private/public partnerships, partnerships with other criminal justice agents (police, prison, etc.) and reminded the assembly that there is a need to expand our associates if CEP is to grow and develop. He noted that CEP was at a crossroads and it needs a challenge or it will become dormant and non-existent. CEP needs new members and new ideas if it is to prosper. With this as background, he challenged the group to think of joining forces with North American probation associations to attempt a world congress on probation.

During the past three years CEP has held workshops on The European Rules on Community Sanctions and Measures, Electronic Monitoring, Practice and Significance of Volunteers, Sex Offenders, and on Effective Practice in Probation.

During the CEP business meeting, Joao Figueiredo of Portugal was elected to the office of President of CEP and conducted a discussion regarding the future activities of CEP. Some themes emerging from the assembly that CEP might work on in the next three years included:

- Examining ways to improve the relationship between probation and prisons, police and prosecution.
- Exploring the essential values that must be the starting place of an effective probation service.
- Understanding the cultural framework that forms the environment that probation works in.

- Finding ways for probation to adapt to a changing environment but not forgetting probation's roots.
- Seeking ways to ensure that probation has a mandate from the community for work with offenders.
- Working on mechanisms to improve cross-border exchanges and sharing perspectives.
- Reaching out to probation workers and explaining the work of CEP and how it supports line efforts.
- Dialoguing and debating "what works" in community sanctions.

In his closing remarks, President Figueiredo noted that we need to be realistic about crime and delinquency especially, the

increases in youth crime, organized crime, the fact that there is more violent crime and racial violence. He challenged the delegates to find ways for probation to contribute to the construction of a safer society. Finally, we must encourage the development and use of scientific research as foundational to an effective probation practice.

It is interesting to note that probation in Europe appears to be struggling with similar problems as those faced in North America — issues around the effective use of community sanctions, best practices, ensuring judicial and public support, and funding/resource concerns. Much can be gained by listening and contributing to the probation dialogue that is emerging around the world.



EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The National Institute of Corrections, working in concert with the National Association of Probation Executives and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University, has scheduled the Executive Development Program for new probation and parole executives through the year 2002.

This highly acclaimed program offers newly appointed chief executive officers in probation and parole relevant management training and an introduction to various networks. This weeklong training experience is provided at no cost to the participant.

This program will be offered at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas, on the following dates: September 23-28, 2001, March 31-April 5, 2002, and September 23-27, 2002.

NAPE members who are aware of new probation executives are encouraged to contact **J. Richard Faulkner, Jr.**, Community Corrections Specialist at the National Institute of Corrections; he may be reached at (202) 514-0100.

CHURCH AND STATE: WORKING TOGETHER

by

Dan Richard Beto

Director

Correctional Management Institute of Texas

Sam Houston State University

Huntsville, Texas

Religion and the Public Square in the 21st Century. Edited by Ryan Streeter. Indianapolis, Indiana: Hudson Institute, 2001. 92 pp. \$11.95.

Throughout the last presidential campaign the role of organized religion in addressing the ills of society was a topic frequently discussed and debated. Following his election to the country's highest office, President George W. Bush created the White House Office for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives. On January 29, 2001, in announcing this new office, President Bush made the following comments:

It is one of the great goals of my administration to invigorate the spirit of involvement and citizenship. We will encourage faith-based and community programs without changing their mission. We will help all in their work to change hearts while keeping a commitment to pluralism.

Government has important responsibilities for public health or public order and civil rights, and government will never be replaced by charities and community groups. Yet, when we see social needs in America, my administration will look first at faith-based programs and community groups, which have proven their power to save and change lives. We will not fund the religious activities of any group, but when people of faith provide social services, we will not discriminate against them.

As long as there are secular alternatives, faith-based charities should be able to compete for funding on an equal basis and in a manner that does not cause them to sacrifice their mission.

Prior to the presidential election, the Hudson Institute and the Johnson Foundation sponsored a conference on "The Future of Government Partnerships with the Faith Community" on April 25-26, 2000, at Wingspread in Racine, Wisconsin. Attending this gathering was a relatively small group of academics, church leaders, persons engaged in crafting policy, elected officials, and representatives of a number of private organizations created to promote programs and initiatives to improve the circumstances of "the least, the last, and the lost" of society. A product of this meeting is *Religion and the Public Square in the 21st Century*, a modest publication that contains the proceedings from the conference.

Leading off this volume is a preface by John J. DiIulio, Jr., the Frederic Fox Leadership Professor of Politics, Religion, and Civil Society at the University of Pennsylvania and the Director of

the White House Office for Faith-Based and Community Initiatives, in which he answers the question "Can sacred places serve civic purposes?" in the affirmative. He also stresses the importance of research in providing evidence that faith-based programs reduce "crime, delinquency, and other forms of socioeconomic failure and deviance."

In the first chapter, Ryan Streeter, a Research Associate at the Hudson Institute's Welfare Policy Center, provides a brief history of the relationship between religious and public institutions, particularly how that relationship has been impacted by the "Charitable Choice" provision of the 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act, commonly known as the welfare reform act. Charitable Choice refers to statutory conditions under which states may enter into funding relationships with religious organizations that provide social services using state and federal funds that originated with the creation of the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families Program in 1996. In addition to discussing Charitable Choice, Streeter gives the reader an overview of the conference.

Streeter's chapter is followed by the contribution of *Washington Post* columnist and Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution E. J. Dionne, who discusses the difficulty in defining religion's role in public/private partnerships. He also stresses, like DiIulio, the necessity to subject faith-based social programs to tougher evaluations in an effort to assess their efficacy. Dionne concludes his presentation by drawing on the words of historian Richard Fox, who wrote of the power of religion in public life:

Religion allows people to grapple with the human mysteries that neither science nor politics can address. But it also provides a force that science and politics can call on in their efforts to understand and transform the social world.

The remarks of Dan Coats, a former United States Senator from Indiana, make up the third chapter; he is currently Special Counsel at the law firm of Verner, Liipfert, Bernhard, McPherson, and Hand in Washington, D.C. In his chapter he describes events that led him to launch the Project for American Renewal, an effort aimed at empowering organizations that desire to redeem communities. He also discusses the importance of grassroots initiatives, lobbying efforts, and meaningful partnerships in impacting social problems.

In the next chapter Carl Esbeck presents a discussion of legal issues surrounding governmental funding of faith-based organizations. Esbeck, presently on leave from the University of Missouri School of Law, is the Director of the Center for Law

and Religious Freedom, the advocacy division of the Christian Legal Society.

The fifth chapter, contributed by Stanley Carlson-Thies, Director of Social Policy at the Center for Public Justice, focuses on "what public officials need to know and do about Charitable Choice." In comparing Charitable Choice in nine states, Carlson-Thies gives Texas high marks for its efforts in breaking down barriers that thwart implementation.

In the next chapter, Amy Sherman, Senior Fellow at the Welfare Policy Center of the Hudson Institute, addresses "what the faith community needs to know and do about Charitable Choice." She provides a thoughtful discussion of the roles faith-based organizations can play in the delivery of human services. In addition, Chairman, who is also the Urban Ministries Advisor at Trinity Presbyterian Church in Charlottesville, Virginia, raises a number of issues that faith-based organizations must come to terms with in working with the government.

The presentation provided by Don Eberly, Director of The Civil Society Project and Chairman of the National Fatherhood Initiative, that is found in the seventh chapter, is relatively brief and contributes little to the discussion. Eberly does, however, make an interesting point about the transfer of wealth:

... we are at the beginning of a massive, and unprecedented, transfer of wealth. The baby boom generation will start inheriting three to four trillion by the years 2010-2015, and when that is combined with the wealth that we'll have created, there will be ten or fifteen trillion dollars to direct, potentially, to new purposes. That's available to do what? We'll have more than is needed for investing in private yachts and for the enjoyment of retirement. . . This money ought to be captured and directed to social sector initiatives. We need to bring together our collective minds to create vehicles, mechanisms, tax credit systems, and any number of approaches that would be available to tap these resources and channel them into this process of social reforms.

Assuming what Eberly says is true, then organizations dependent on soft money and goodwill need to begin a strategic planning process now to advantageously position themselves to be on the receiving end of these financial resources.

In chapter eight Streeter, the book's editor, returns to provide a synopsis of the conference discussions. He notes that five general topics emerged from the dialogues that occurred during the conference, and they focused on the following areas:

- evaluation, research, and monitoring of faith-based service providers;
- new, innovative partnerships to produce maximum impact and effectiveness;
- clarity on funding issues;
- education of public officials and faith leaders; and
- the active role of the faith community in shaping the future of the debate.

These five general topics provided guidance for the final chapter, which contains specific recommendations for public officials, religious organizations, and evaluators of faith-based service providers.

Conference participants developed a comprehensive 19 point "code of conduct" for public officials; likewise, an 11 point "code of conduct" or contract was crafted for the faith-based community. As for persons engaged in evaluating faith-based programs, participants crafted an "agenda" for them, which focused on the following areas:

- beginning with the right assumptions;
- measuring effectiveness;
- making sound cross-section comparisons;
- accounting and controlling for extraneous factors; and
- implementing a regional evaluation strategy.

While most of the chapters are informative, chapter nine is by far the most instructive. In it one finds a well-charted road map for developing productive partnerships between governmental agencies and the faith community.

In 1967, the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice wrote:

Our society has for too long neglected the conditions of life in the inner-city slum. The past several years have seen unprecedented recognition of the gravity of those conditions and commitment of resources to their amelioration. But if we fail to devote, in the future, even more money and people and energy and concern to the problems of our inner cities, we must be willing to pay the price — a price already high and mounting.

Crime is only part of that price. But the importance of ameliorating social conditions in order to prevent crime is not to be minimized. Each day additional law-abiding citizens turn their backs on the city; fear for personal safety — fear of crime — is a major reason. As they leave, the city changes; the quality of life deteriorates; the crime problem worsens, hurting people not only by forcing them to narrow their lives out of apprehensiveness but also by the most direct and uncompensable of injuries to their person and property — the circle continues around.

Over three decades have passed since that report was written, and inner-city problems not only have continued but have worsened. Strategies heretofore employed to address these problems obviously have not worked, and the time has come to embark on a new course where government consciously reaches out to the faith community — a largely ignored resource — for help.

Religion and the Public Square in the 21st Century, a thought-provoking collection of views from some of the better minds in the country today, not only encourages this type of partnership but it provides a blueprint for action. It is imperative that government officials, policy-makers, criminal and juvenile justice practitioners, and anyone engaged in the delivery of human services embrace the message contained in this book and act accordingly.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

JOB CHANGE FOR DOTY

Theresa Doty, Director of Probation for the Yakima Courts in Washington, has accepted the position of Chief Deputy of Operations for the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California in Los Angeles, effective June 25, 2001. Her new telephone number will be (213) 894-4220 and her new email address will be theresa_doty@cacd.uscourts.gov.

CORBETT RECOGNIZED

On May 22, 2001, during its annual awards dinner, the Correctional Association of Massachusetts honored **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.**, Executive Director of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, by presenting him with the Howard B. Gill Award for 2001. This award is given annually to a practitioner who has performed exemplary service to improve conditions for those who work in the criminal justice system and for those who are served by the system.

Corbett, a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives, serves as Chair of the Reinventing Probation Council of the Manhattan Institute. Before assuming his current position, Corbett was Deputy Commissioner for Field Services for the Massachusetts Probation Service.

TEXAS CORRECTIONS ASSOCIATION HONORS NAPE MEMBERS

Rick Zinsmeyer and **Todd Jermstad** were recognized by the Texas Corrections Association during the organization's annual conference held in San Antonio on June 10-13, 2001.

Zinsmeyer, Director of the Williamson County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Georgetown, Texas, was recognized as the Outstanding Adult Correctional Administrator of the Year. In addition to his duties in Williamson County, Zinsmeyer, a past President of the Texas Corrections Association, serves as Chair of the Texas Probation Training Academy Advisory Board. He is a member of the Texas Reinventing Probation Strategy Group and serves on the Executive Committee of the American Probation and Parole Association.

Jermstad, Staff Attorney for the Bell/Lampasas Counties Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Belton, Texas, was presented with the Sam Houston State University Award for scholarly contributions to the corrections profession. This award has been presented by the Criminal Justice Center and the Texas Corrections Association since 1985. Jermstad, a member of the Texas Reinventing Probation Strategy Group, is a frequent contributor to publications peculiar to the corrections profession.

LAVOIE PASSES AWAY

On May 17, 2001, **Bobby L. Lavoie**, Director of the Division of Probation for the Georgia Department of Corrections, took his own life. He was a public servant of the highest calibre, serving his state for 37 years. Lavoie participated in the Executive Development Program held in Huntsville in September 2000. He

was a member of the Executives of State Probation Network coordinated by the National Institute of Corrections.

Rick Faulkner with the National Institute of Corrections, who was close to Lavoie, said: "Bobby was a warm and giving person and it is a great shock to those of us who knew and respected him to lose such a person. He had no children and had been divorced for many years; however, he was not alone because of his many friends and associates. He will long be remembered for his dedication and service to others."

Michael Nail is serving as the Division's Acting Director.

RUSSI ASSUMES NEW POSITION

Raul Russi, Commissioner of the New York City Probation Department, retired on May 23, 2001. He has accepted a position with America Works, a private agency that finds jobs for offenders on probation and parole. Russi was active in the National Association of Probation Executives and the American Probation and Parole Association; he was also a member of the Urban Chiefs Network convened by the National Institute of Corrections. He brought many positive changes to the New York City Probation Department, and he may look back on his service to the City of New York with pride.

Russi may be reached through America Works at (212) 244-5627, extension 162.

NEW MEMBERS

In the Winter 2001 issue of *Executive Exchange*, it was reported that 15 new individual members and one organizational member joined the Association. Since that time, three new individual members have joined:

Denis Agniel, Chairman, Missouri Board of Probation and Parole, 1511 Christy Drive, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.

Chris Mechler, Court Services Officer Specialist, Office of Judicial Administration, Kansas Judicial Center, 301 West 10th Street, Topeka, Kansas 66612-1507.

Barbara A. Valicenti, Director, Greene County Probation Department, P.O. Box 267, Catskill, New York 12414.

In addition, an individual membership has been upgraded to an organizational membership:

Social Services Department (Jesus Reyes, Director), Circuit Court of Cook County, Criminal Courts Administration Building, 2650 South California, Room 901, Chicago, Illinois 60608.