

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

SPRING 2010

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Greetings all! By now you likely have developed a strategic plan for the year and are mobilizing available resources to implement innovative concepts. As leaders, you have determined the "right things to do" and are working with managers and line staff to ensure identified objectives and goals are achieved in the appropriate manner. My point of emphasis in this message is focused on the "how" (execution) that follows the "what" (vision).

"Doing things the right way" is in large part an acquired behavior and we can agree that none of us has all the answers. It is also worth admitting that we all have skeletons in our closets based on prior mistakes made and lessons learned. Given those acknowledgments, there are certain expectations concerning ethics, values and the standards by which trained leaders conduct themselves.

In two northeastern Pennsylvania counties an ever-widening federal corruption probe became public in January 2009. Two Luzerne County judges are awaiting trial charged with taking \$2.8 million in kickbacks to place juveniles in for-profit detention centers. More than twenty people in that county, including a school superintendent, a third judge, four courthouse officials, and five school board members are being prosecuted for a variety of unrelated criminal acts. This past week,



a county commissioner and former commissioner in neighboring Lackawanna County were indicted for allegedly receiving more than \$450,000 in cash and benefits from county contractors. At the state level

a jury has been deliberating for several days concerning the fate of a powerful former Pennsylvania legislator and three aides regarding charges of theft, conspiracy and conflict of interest. Prosecutors maintain they ran a scheme to siphon off taxpayer resources for political campaigns and to underwrite other activities. These well publicized examples and others plaguing many jurisdictions, while not the norm, should serve as a reminder that there is a right and a wrong way to obtain desired outcomes. When evaluating great past and present leaders, I am impressed with "what" (achievements)

they did, however, even more extraordinary are those icons who were successful doing things the right way.

Every day in our respective positions there are many challenging decisions. There are often forks in the road offering a variety of choices and approaches to complete our work. As we continue to move the probation field forward, let's reinforce the theme that it's not just what we do, it's how we do it.

John Tuttle
President

CONTENTS

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| President's Message, <i>John Tuttle</i> | 1 |
| Association Activities | 2 |
| The Effects of Probation Executives' Personality and Leadership Style upon their Leadership Success, <i>Won-Jae Lee, Ph.D., James Phelps, Ph.D., Christie Davidson, and Dan Richard Beto</i> | 3 |
| Partnerships to Enhance Public Safety: A Canadian Model, <i>Sonya Spencer and David Pisapio</i> | 11 |
| New Horizons: ICPA Barbados Conference, <i>Donald G. Evans</i> | 17 |
| From the Bookshelf, <i>Donald G. Evans and Dan Richard Beto</i> | 19 |
| News from the Field | 21 |

ASSOCIATION ACTIVITIES

NEW OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS ELECTED

Commencing in October 2009 and continuing into May 2010, members of the Nominations and Elections Committee solicited nominations for the various offices in the National Association of Probation Executives. Immediately prior to the publication of this issue of Executive Exchange, a slate of candidates had been developed. Since there were no contested races, in accordance with the Association's constitution, the Secretary cast a single vote for the slate of candidates. The new Officers and Directors of the Association, who will assume office on June 1, 2010, are as follows:

| | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <i>President</i> Ellen F. Brokofsky <i>Nebraska</i> | <i>Past President</i> John Tuttle <i>Pennsylvania</i> | <i>Central Region</i> Robert L. Bingham <i>Indiana</i> |
| <i>Vice President</i> Ronald Schweer <i>Kansas</i> | <i>New England Region</i> Bernard Fitzgerald <i>Massachusetts</i> | <i>Western Region</i> Diane McGinnis <i>Arizona</i> |
| <i>Secretary</i> Mack Jenkins <i>California</i> | <i>Mid-Atlantic Region</i> Francine M. Perretta <i>New York</i> | <i>At-Large</i> Thomas Costa <i>Pennsylvania</i> |
| <i>Treasurer</i> Martin J. Krizay <i>California</i> | <i>Southern Region</i> Vickie Spriggs <i>Texas</i> | <i>At-Large</i> Javed Syed <i>Texas</i> |

NAPE EVENTS IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Plan to attend the annual events of the National Association of Probation Executives in Washington, D.C., at the Hilton Washington on August 14-15, 2010, immediately prior to the Annual Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association. The schedule of events is as follows:

NAPE Members Reception
Saturday, August 14, 2010
5:00 to 7:00 PM

NAPE Awards Breakfast
Sunday, August 15, 2010
8:00 to 10:30 AM

During the Awards Breakfast, the *Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year*, the *George M. Keiser Award for Exceptional Leadership*, and the *Dan Richard Beto Award* will be presented.

NAPE Board of Directors Meeting
Sunday, August 15, 2010
10:30 AM to 12:00 PM

The rooms for these events have yet to be assigned. Once the rooms have been identified, we will send out a notice via email. Information will also be available at the hotel and in the APPA program booklet.

THE EFFECTS OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES' PERSONALITY AND LEADERSHIP STYLE UPON THEIR LEADERSHIP SUCCESS

by

Won-Jae Lee, Ph.D.
James Phelps, Ph.D.
Christie Davidson
and
Dan Richard Beto

Abstract

To both probation practitioners and researchers, leadership has long been an important topic of interest. Despite the emphasis on effective leadership, there has been no empirical leadership research to guide effective leaders in the area of probation. In response, the purpose of this pilot research is to answer what makes an effective leader by assessing the effects of probation executives' leadership style behavior and personality on their leadership success.

This research employed a mail survey sent to 187 probation directors across the United States. All recipients are members of the National Association of Probation Executives, an organization comprised of leaders in the probation profession. The sampled directors were asked to self-assess their leadership style, personality, and success as well as provide their demographic information. Out of the 135 responses, a usable sample of 131 responses was obtained (a response rate of 70.1%). The MLQ Leadership Style inventory was employed to measure three distinct leadership styles and leadership success while the Big Five Personality inventory was utilized to measure five major dimensions of personality, as recommended by a thorough review of the literature on leadership success.

Overall findings from the descriptive analysis suggest that the sampled probation directors exhibit transformational leadership, higher levels of desirable personality traits (i.e., extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness) and lower levels of undesirable personality (neuroticism), all theoretically contributing to leadership success. Results from the bivariate analysis clearly indicate that transformational leadership style and all personalities have a substantially greater association with leadership success. Consistently, results from the multivariate regression analysis indicate that transformational leadership style has a substantial contribution to make in predicting the sampled directors' leadership success. Discussions and general policy suggestions are provided to help probation administrators not only improve the effectiveness of their leadership but also develop hiring/promotional criteria and leadership development programs for future leaders.

Introduction

Probation as a suspended prison sentence should be one of the most promising formal social control mechanisms employed in the United States to promote public safety and serve a large offender population. At year end 2008, 83.8% (4,270,917) of a total of 5,095,200 adult offenders under local, state, and federal community supervision were on probation and the adult probation population has slightly but steadily grown on an annual basis (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2009). No other component of the criminal justice system has the dual responsibility to control offenders while concurrently offering a "helping hand" for offenders to maintain community and family ties.

Despite higher cost-effectiveness and a lower recidivism rate than that of prison, it is clear that probation has been distrusted and criticized by political leaders and the public for its perceived failure to contribute to public safety (e.g., high number of unnoticed violations and absconders, and high recidivism rates among probationers). Due to a lack of credibility with politicians and the public, probation unfortunately has suffered from less financial resources, negatively impacting the implementation of quality supervision strategies and specialized treatment for various special needs offender groups (Petersilia, 1997). Consequently, probation has been recognized as "the most troubled component of the criminal justice system" (Reinventing Probation Council, 2000, p. 49). In response to that negative assessment, it is imperative to build an effective probation system to better provide for public safety, and consequently to regain trust, confidence, and support from the political arena and the public (Beto, Corbett, & DiIulio, 2000). To implement effective probation practices and to reduce the challenges they face, current probation administrators and managers are being asked to lead their departments, rather than solely managing them. Absent sustained leadership, probation will fail to engender public support and positively impact public safety.

To both probation practitioners and researchers, leadership has long been an important topic of interest. Despite the emphasis on effective probation leadership, there has been no empirical leadership research to provide guidance to this particular area of probation. In response to this need, this pilot research proposes to answer what makes an effective leader by assessing the effects of probation executives' leadership style behavior and personality on their leadership success. According to Bass (1990), "leadership can be learned, and it can—and should—be the subject of management training and development" (p. 27). In a similar vein, Kirkpatrick and Locke (1991) contended that individuals could learn leadership traits even though some are born with leadership traits. Findings from the present study will provide substantively useful and practical managerial information on which leadership

style and personality are significant determinants of leadership success, and may help probation administrators and managers not only better lead their department, but also develop hiring/promotional criteria and leadership development programs for more effective future leaders.

Literature Review

Theories and Definition of Leadership

To understand leadership, it is important to recognize that leadership theories have evolved over time. Two schools of thought have arisen concerning how leadership effectiveness can be approached. These schools include personal trait theory and transformational theory. The earliest studies of leadership are based upon the personal trait theory assuming that leaders were born with certain inherited personal traits and natural abilities, such as power and influence, and conceptualized leadership as a single "Great Man." However, little empirical research succeeded to find the strong relationship between a set of personal traits and leadership, or to differentiate non-leaders from effective leaders (e.g. House & Aditya, 1997). Due to the inconsistent and disappointing results of early research, there has been a shift away from the personal trait approach to exploring behavioral characteristics of leaders, such as transformational leadership theory (Smith & Canger, 2004).

The main focuses of the transformational leadership theory are placed on what on the job activities, roles, and responsibilities leaders perform and how they behave toward their followers, which has been critical to determine how effective leaders differ in their behavior from ineffective ones. As DiIulio (1987) notes: "Organizations are largely the shadows of their executives It does not matter whether one is talking about Harvard University, the Chrysler Corporation, or the Texas Department of Corrections. The executive's skills and abilities, his sense of mission and dedication to duty, are decisive in determining how — and how well — an organization runs" (p. 187).

The dominant behavioral leadership theory is Bass' (1985) transformational leadership, originally introduced by Burns (1978), which has captured many leadership scholars' attentions. Bass (1985) succinctly defined transformation leadership as a process in which a leader increases followers' awareness of what is right and important and motivates them to perform beyond expectation. Transformational leadership is different from transactional leadership, which refers to management and "occurs when one person takes the initiative in making contact with others for the purpose of an exchange of valued things" (Bass, 1985, p. 19). Transformational leadership as true leadership goes beyond transactional leadership and "occurs when one or more person[s] engage with others in such a way that leaders and followers raise one another to higher levels of motivation and morality" (Bass, 1985, p. 20). Therefore, these two different leadership styles should be distinguished from each other.

Transformational, Transactional, and Laissez-faire Leadership Behaviors

Bass and Avolio (1997) proposed three major leadership styles: transformational leadership, transactional leadership, and laissez-faire leadership. The following four behavioral characteristics are mainly associated with transformational leaders: ideal-

ized influences (decide, share, and encourage a clear vision, mission and purpose for organization, while being role-models for followers), inspirational motivation (communicate a vision of a desired future state and high level of expectations to make the pain of change worth the meaningful and challenging effort), intellectual stimulation (challenge and inspire followers to go beyond their own self-interests for the desired good of the group), and individual consideration (coach and elevate the concerns of individual followers from lower-level physical needs to higher-level psychological needs). According to Judge and Bono (2000), these behaviors support a transformational process wherein leaders inspire followers in the identical line with a vision for organization that goes beyond their own self-interests.

In contrast, transactional leaders usually display behaviors associated with the following (Bass & Avolio, 2004): contingent reward, management-by-exception (active), and management-by-exception (passive). According to Bass (1990), transactional leadership is defined as a process of gaining compliance from followers through contacts with the leader. Specifically, contingent reward refers to an exchange between leaders and followers of recognizing performance towards attainment of organizational goals. Alternatively, transformational leaders use either of the two forms of management-by-exception (active or passive) to correct followers' poor performance through corrective criticism, negative feedback, and negative enforcement: a leader taking the active form of management-by-exception intensively focuses attention on mistakes, complaints, and poor performance or rule violations, and then concentrates full attention on taking corrective action, whereas the leader using passive management-by-exception intervenes only after detecting serious mistakes. In essence, both active and passive management-by-exception are primarily based on implicit or explicit contingent reinforcement of rules, keeping track of and avoiding mistakes. Finally, laissez-faire leadership refers to behaviors where leaders avoid accepting and doing any of the leadership and management responsibilities, reflecting the absence of all the transformational and transactional behaviors mentioned previously (Bass, 1990).

It is theoretically clear that transformational leadership behaviors, in contrast to the transactional and laissez-faire leadership behaviors can develop followers into leaders to fulfill a clearly defined vision and mission for any organization. Empirical research has demonstrated a highly positive relationship between transformational leaders and leadership success across many different types of organization (e.g. Medley & Larochelle, 1995; Wofford, Whittington, & Goodwin, 2001). Additionally, Howell and Avolio (1993) found transformational leadership predicts organizational effectiveness after controlling for transactional leadership, but the reverse is not true. Most of the literature empirically supports the theoretical propositions that transformational leadership is positively related to leadership success, while transactional leadership is positively but weakly related and laissez-faire leadership is negatively related to leadership success (e.g. Bono & Judge, 2004; Dumdum, Lowe, & Avolio, 2002; Lowe, Kroeck, & Sivasubramaniam 1996).

In the relationship between transformational leadership and leadership success, a recent meta-analysis conducted by Lowe et al. (1996) found that transformational leadership behaviors substantially correlated with and significantly predicted both subordinate attitudes and measures of leader effectiveness, either subordinate perceptions of leadership effectiveness or organizational measures. In sum, these findings suggest that transforma-

tional leadership is a better indicator than the other two leadership styles in correlating with and predicting leadership success. Therefore, it appears that transformational leadership is the most critical element to understand the process of how true leaders affect subordinates and their performance.

Personality of Transformational Leaders

As noted earlier, there has been a shift from the personal trait approach to transformational leadership theory since many scholars doubted that any personal traits were reliably associated with leadership success. Despite its unpopularity, however, personality traits, as a correlate and predictor of successful leadership style and effectiveness, have demonstrated consistent reliability and usefulness, and there has been a revival of this approach in recent years (e.g., Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). For example, Kenny and Zaccaro (1983) concluded between 49% and 82% of the variance in transformational leadership behavior could be explained by stable personality traits across different situations.

Among many personality trait measurements of a leader's performance-based reputation, the Big Five Model personality traits has enhanced the value and usefulness of personality trait measurement in correlating with and predicting successful leadership (Hogan, et al., 1994). As the most popular structure of personality measurement, the Big Five Model components, developed by Costa and McCrae (1992), cover most constructs of personality and entail neuroticism (e.g. impulsive), extraversion (e.g. active), openness (e.g. open-minded), agreeableness (e.g. selfless), and conscientiousness (e.g. strong-minded). The principal factors of this five-component model were found to integrate almost every major personality measurement inventory (Wiggins & Pincus, 1992). Existing literature (e.g. Silvershorne, 2001) has empirically supported the contention that effective leaders tend to score significantly higher on extraversion, openness, agreeableness and conscientiousness, and lower on neuroticism, than non-effective leaders.

In examining the relation between personality traits and transformational leadership, some studies (e.g., Dubinsky, Yammario, Jolson, & Spangler, 1995) have not found expected relationships but there are recent studies that have successfully linked personality traits to transformational leadership. Judge and Bono (2000) found that extraversion and agreeableness among the Big Five components significantly and positively predicted transformational leadership. More recently, Judge, Bono, Ilies, and Gerhardt (2002), in their meta-analysis of the extensive literature on personality and leadership, found that extraversion, openness, and conscientiousness were all positively correlated and neuroticism was negatively correlated with both leadership emergence (being perceived as leader-like) and effectiveness (being able to influence subordinates to perform). Also, after regressing all Big Five personality traits on overall leadership, they found that extraversion, openness, and conscientiousness are the most consistent predictors of both leadership emergence and effectiveness. Overall, although personality measures alone have been considered to be insufficient to correlate with and predict successful leadership, these findings indicate a significant role of the Big Five Model to do so.

Given the accumulated theoretical explanation and empirical findings, both leadership style behaviors and personality traits have been recognized as important attributes to successful lead-

ership. Extending the previous literature of both leadership style behaviors and personality traits into this study, the following six specific hypotheses were developed and tested to generalize the previous findings to the probation setting:

H₁: Overall leadership styles, especially transformational leadership, will be more important than personality traits in correlating with leadership success.

H₂: Transactional leadership will be weakly but significantly and positively related, but laissez-faire leadership behavior will be significantly and negatively related to leadership success.

H₃: Extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness will be all positively correlated, but neuroticism will be negatively correlated with leadership success.

H₄: Overall leadership styles will be more important than personality traits in predicting leadership success.

H₅: Transactional leadership will weakly but significantly and positively predict, but laissez-faire leadership will significantly and negatively predict leadership success.

H₆: Extraversion, openness, and conscientiousness among the Big Five Model personality traits will significantly and positively predict leadership success.

Method

Sample and Data Collection

This study was conducted under the auspice of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE). Founded in 1981, the NAPE is a professional organization representing the chief executive officers of local, county, and state probation agencies, and has been substantially devoted to the issue of leadership and the challenges faced by probation administrators. The survey was distributed through the mail to 187 members of the NAPE who are directors of probation departments in the United States. In the survey, the sampled directors were asked to self-assess their leadership style, personality, and organizational outcomes as well as provide certain demographic information. To secure a high response rate for a valid and reliable analysis, one follow-up survey was mailed. Also, both surveys included an encouraging cover letter from NAPE Executive Director Christie Davidson and emphasized anonymity of responses, guaranteeing confidentiality. The total survey period began on April 15 and ended on June 15, 2009. Each respondent was provided a self-addressed, stamped envelope to return the survey directly to the researcher at Angelo State University. Survey responses were obtained from a total of 135 probation directors in the U.S. After examining the data on an item-by-item, and case-by-case basis, however, it appeared that of the 135 responses, 4 cases required deletion due to missing data. This reduced the usable data sample to 131, giving a response rate of 70.1%, indicating very good survey quality for adequate analysis and reporting (Maxfield & Babbie, 2005).

Individual status data listed in Table 1 represents respondents' socio-demographic and work-experience information. The selec-

Executive Exchange

tion of these individual status variables incorporated into the survey was guided by an extensive literature review. Males accounted for 67.9% of the survey population. The average age of the respondents was 50.7 years (the minimum was 34 years, and the maximum 72 years), with 90.1% reported to be Caucasian, compared to African-American (4.6%), Hispanic (3.1%), and Others (2.3%). With respect to educational background, 45% had a bachelor's degree or less, while a slight majority (55%) had earned a master's degree or doctorate degree (50.4% and 4.6%, respectively). Respondents were employed by their department as director for an average of 6.34 years, ranging from a minimum of 0.27 to a maximum of 34 years. Of the 131 respondents, the majority (64.1%) were selected or promoted as director from outside the department. The responses indicate that the majority (61.8%) directed departments with less than 100 total employees. It should be noted that these individual status variables are not being studied. Instead, they are used as control variables in this study.

Table 1
Individual Status Variable Statistics (N = 131)

| Variable | N% | Mean | Min | Max | SD* |
|-----------------------------------|------------|-------|------|-----|------|
| <u>Gender</u> | | | | | 0.47 |
| Male | 89 (67.9) | | | | |
| Female | 42 (32.1) | | | | |
| <u>Age</u> | in years | 50.67 | 34 | 72 | 7.48 |
| <u>Race</u> | | | | | 0.30 |
| Caucasian | 118 (90.1) | | | | |
| Non-Caucasian | 13 (9.9) | | | | |
| <u>Education Level</u> | | | | | 0.50 |
| Bachelors degree or less | 59 (45) | | | | |
| Masters degree or more | 72 (55) | | | | |
| <u>Length of Time as Director</u> | in years | 6.34 | 0.27 | 34 | 6.23 |
| <u>Director Selection Method</u> | | | | | 0.48 |
| Inside | 47 (35.9) | | | | |
| Outside | 84 (64.1) | | | | |
| <u>Total Employee Population</u> | | | | | 2.01 |
| Less than 12 | 40 (30.5) | | | | |
| 25-49 | 22 (16.8) | | | | |
| 50-99 | 19 (14.5) | | | | |
| 100-149 | 14 (10.7) | | | | |
| 150-299 | 13 (9.9) | | | | |
| 300-999 | 13 (9.9) | | | | |
| 1000 or more | 10 (7.6) | | | | |

* Standard Deviation

Measurement of Variables & Descriptive Analyses

To self-assess their leadership style, personality, and leadership success, two standardized questionnaires were used to gather data from the sampled directors. First, as suggested by Bass and Avolio (2004), the 45-item form of the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ 5X-Short, Self) was used to conceptually capture three distinct leadership styles¹ (transformational, transactional, and laissez-faire leadership) and three leadership outcomes (subordinates' extra effort, high satisfaction, and effectiveness). The three leadership outcome components were conceptually reduced into leadership success.² Questionnaire

items were rated using a five-point response scale: (0) not at all; (1) once in a while; (2) sometimes; (3) fairly often; and (4) frequently, if not always. Participants were asked to self-assess how frequently, on average, they displayed the leadership style and outcome behaviors. Second, the personality inventory used was the 60-item form of the NEO Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) (Costa & McCrae, 1992). This test is a concise measure of the five major dimensions of personal traits: neuroticism, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness. The items were measured using the five-point scale, ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

While no missing response for the individual status variables was found, there were a minimum number of missing values for both the NEO-FFI personality trait and MLQ leadership style variables. Neutral response option, guided by its manual (Costa & McCrae, 1992), was selected for 5 missing responses for the NEO-FFI variables. Due to no specific guideline by its manual (Bass & Avolio, 2004), however, 45 missing responses for the MLQ variables were replaced with the means of each variable. Table 2 presents means, standard deviations, and reliability for all personal traits, leadership style variables, and leadership success. The Cronbach Alpha statistical reliability procedure was applied to test for the internal consistency of each scale. Alpha reliability coefficients for each scale in Table 2 ranged from 0.56 to 0.88. Sample reliabilities for the five personal traits were well above the minimal level of acceptability. Among the leadership style and leadership success behaviors, the reliability of laissez-faire leadership was somewhat below the minimal level of acceptability.³

Table 2
Personality and Leadership Variable Descriptions, Statistics, and Reliability (N = 131)

| Variable | No. of Final Items | Item Mean | SD* | α^{**} |
|-----------------------------------------|--------------------|-----------|------|---------------|
| <u>Five Factor Model of Personality</u> | | | | |
| Neuroticism | 12 | 13.08 | 6.50 | 0.84 |
| Extraversion | 12 | 31.95 | 6.62 | 0.85 |
| Openness | 12 | 28.00 | 6.16 | 0.77 |
| Agreeableness | 12 | 33.96 | 5.51 | 0.77 |
| Conscientiousness | 12 | 36.92 | 5.25 | 0.81 |
| <u>Three Factor Model of Leadership</u> | | | | |
| Transformational Leadership | 20 | 3.15 | 0.43 | 0.88 |
| Transactional Leadership | 12 | 1.83 | 0.33 | 0.62 |
| Laissez-faire Leadership | 4 | 0.59 | 0.48 | 0.56 |
| <u>Leadership Success</u> | 9 | 3.21 | 0.43 | 0.86 |

* Standard Deviation; ** Cronbach's Alpha reliability scores

Although there is no published point to compare the average mean of each leadership style scale, the average mean of each scale, by using two cut-off points (1.5 and 2.5, on the 5-point scale, ranging from 0 to 4), was clearly broken into the following three groups: laissez-faire leadership (0.59) for a low-average group, transactional leadership (1.83) for a neither low- nor high-average group, and transformational leadership (3.15) for a high-average group. Among the three leadership style variables, transformational leadership was found to have the highest average mean. As for comparison of the five factor model of personality, upon the published point in the professional manual (Costa & McCrae, 1992), the accumulated score for neuroticism (13.08) was

much lower than the published average score (19.07), reflecting relatively high emotional stability among the participating probation directors. Similarly, the accumulated scores for the other four positive personalities exceeded the published average scores, indicative of relatively high extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness among the participants. The overall findings from the descriptive analyses suggest that the sampled probation directors have a desirable leadership style (transformational leadership) and leadership personalities, all theoretically contributing to leadership success.

Results

Bivariate Analysis

Consistent with existing literature, transformational leadership style was significantly and positively related. Also, laissez-faire leadership was significantly and negatively correlated with leadership success. However, transactional leadership style ($r = 0.17$) was positively but weakly and insignificantly associated with leadership success. Among the leadership style factors, transformational leadership ($r = 0.68$) was found to have the strongest relationship to leadership success, while laissez-faire leadership ($r = -0.30$) was negatively but moderately correlated. As for the association of the five personality factors with leadership success, as expected, extraversion, openness, agreeableness, and conscientiousness were all positively correlated, but neuroticism was found negatively correlated with leadership success. However, although conscientiousness ($r = 0.47$), among the personality factors, had the strongest but still moderate relationship to leadership success. The correlation matrix in Table 3 depicts these results. Taken together, these findings suggest that the hypotheses (H_1 , H_2 , and H_3) are fully supported and indicate that transformational leadership style, rather than the other leadership styles, and all personalities has a substantially greater association with leadership success.

Table 3
Zero-Order Correlations

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
|--------------------------------|---|---------|---------|-------|---------|---------|---------|--------|---------|
| 1. Leadership Success | 1 | -0.44** | 0.44** | 0.19* | 0.34** | 0.47** | 0.68** | 0.17 | -0.30** |
| 2. Neuroticism | | 1 | -0.49** | -0.01 | -0.32** | -0.42** | -0.46** | 0.10 | 0.24** |
| 3. Extraversion | | | 1 | 0.11 | 0.49** | 0.35** | 0.46** | -0.07 | -0.27** |
| 4. Openness | | | | 1 | 0.04 | -0.03 | 0.24** | 0.17* | 0.04 |
| 5. Agreeableness | | | | | 1 | 0.22** | 0.33** | -0.12 | -0.06 |
| 6. Conscientiousness | | | | | | 1 | 0.34** | 0.04 | -0.28** |
| 7. Transformational Leadership | | | | | | | 1 | 0.29** | -0.17 |
| 8. Transactional Leadership | | | | | | | | 1 | 0.15 |
| 9. Laissez-faire Leadership | | | | | | | | | 1 |

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$, two-tailed

Multivariate Analysis

Three stepwise Ordinary Least Square (OLS) regression analyses⁴ (see Table 4) were employed to assess whether personality and leadership style variables influence the sampled directors' self-rated leadership success. In each equation of the table, a total of seven socio-demographic and work-experience characteristics (gender, age, race, education level, length of time as director,

director selection method, and total employee population) were viewed and included as control variables, rather than as causal variables. Equation 1 examines only the impact of personality factor on the sampled directors' leadership success after statistically controlling for the effects of individual status variables, and demonstrates a significant and good-model fit ($\chi^2 = 19.23$, $df = 5$, $p < 0.001$) in predicting leadership success. Forty-four percent of the variance in the dependent variable of leadership success was accounted for by three individual status control variables (education level, age, and gender) and two personality variables (conscientiousness and extraversion). That is, among the five personality factor variables, self-rated successful leadership tends to obtain from the sampled directors who scored significantly higher on extraversion (e.g. active) and conscientiousness (e.g. strong-minded) than their counterparts.

Equation 2 examines only the impact of effects of leadership style factors on the sampled directors' leadership success after statistically controlling for the effects of individual status variables, and demonstrates a significant and good-model fit ($\chi^2 = 75.55$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.001$). Out of all individual status and leadership style variables, one control variable (length of time as director) and two leadership style variables (transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles), based upon each statistically significant, high partial correlation were included in Equation 2.

Among all leadership styles, transformational leadership (Beta = 0.74) was found to have the strongest predictor of leadership success. This finding indicates that transformational leadership has both statistical and substantive significance in predicting directors' leadership success. Also, laissez-faire leadership (Beta = -0.20) was a significant and negative but weak predictor of leadership success. However, transactional leadership was not found to be a significant determinant. One additional finding relevant to Equation 2 is worth mentioning. After controlling for the effects of the individual status variables, transformational and laissez-faire leadership style variables included accounted for 63% of the variance in the dependent variable, leadership

success. This portion of variance, explained by Equation 2 (R -square = 0.64) is almost 1.45 times higher than that explained by Equation 1 (R -square = 0.44). This finding suggests that leadership style factors have a more substantial contribution in predicting a directors' leadership success than their personality factor.

Equation 3 of Table 4 is the final and most complete best-fit regression model. All individual status variables were treated as statistical control variables to mainly determine whether the significant personalities and leadership style behaviors found in Equation 1 and 2 are still statistically significant. Equation 3 shows a significant and good model fit ($\chi^2 = 52.66$, $df = 5$, $p < 0.001$). The proportion of variance explained by Equation 3 (R -square = 0.68) is slightly higher than that explained by Equation 2 (R -square = 0.63) and is almost 1.56 times higher than that explained by Equation 1

Executive Exchange

(R -square = 0.44). This finding indicates that the leadership style behavior factor still has a greater contribution to make in predicting the sampled directors' successful leadership, even after controlling for the effects of the personality factor.

Table 4
The Determinants of Leadership Success

| Included Variables | Equation 1 | | Equation 2 | | Equation 3 | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| | Beta ^a | VIF ^b | Beta ^a | VIF ^b | Beta ^a | VIF ^b |
| <u>Control Variables</u> | | | | | | |
| Length of Time as Director | | | 0.156** | 1.041 | 0.139** | 1.050 |
| Education Level | 0.139* | 1.036 | | | 0.116* | 1.028 |
| Age | 0.324*** | 1.139 | | | | |
| Gender | -0.155* | 1.117 | | | | |
| <u>Personality</u> | | | | | | |
| Conscientiousness | 0.324*** | 1.171 | | | 0.210*** | 1.206 |
| Extraversion | 0.305*** | 1.144 | | | | |
| <u>Leadership Style</u> | | | | | | |
| Transformational Leadership | | | 0.737*** | 1.031 | 0.663*** | 1.153 |
| Laissez-faire Leadership | | | -0.200*** | 1.069 | -0.159** | 1.140 |
| R-square = | 0.435 | | 0.632 | | 0.678 | |
| F = | 19.226 | | 75.554 | | 52.655 | |
| Significance = | .000 | | .000 | | .000 | |

^a Standardized Coefficients; ^b Variance Inflation Factor; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$; *** $p < 0.001$

Five variables were included in Equation 3: two control variables (length of time as director and education level), only one personality variable (conscientiousness), and the same two leadership style behavior variables (transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles). As for leadership style variables, even after entering control and personality variables into the final regression equation, no leadership style behavior variables found in Equation 2 were excluded from the final model. These findings indicate that transformational and laissez-faire leadership styles found in Equation 2 are still maintained due to their significant contributions to predicting leadership success beyond the predictive power of the control and personality variables. Consistently, there was no significant determinant of transactional leadership behavior variables.

Unlike the findings of Equation 1, extraversion was excluded from the final best-fit equation after leadership style variables were included in Equation 3 while only conscientiousness was still included in the final model. These findings suggest that among the personality variables only the effect of conscientiousness on leadership success was direct. In contrast, the effect of extraversion on leadership success was indirect and was mediated through the leadership style variables. Furthermore, the prediction strength of conscientiousness reduced almost one-half ($Beta = 0.32$ in Equation 1 to 0.21 in Equation 3) by including the effects of leadership styles.

Taken together, these findings suggest that the hypotheses (H_4 and H_5) are fully supported. However, extraversion was found to have its indirect impact on leadership success while openness was found to have no significant impact. Therefore, the hypothesis (H_6) is only partially supported. Despite one partially supported hypothesis, these overall findings clearly indicate that the transformational leadership style has more substantial contributions to make in predicting the sampled directors' leadership success. Of the personality traits, conscientiousness contributes

significantly, but weakly, to predict leadership success. In contrast, the transactional leadership style has no contribution to make in predicting leadership success.

Discussion and General Policy Implication

The literature suggests that the present probation system, despite its actual benefits, fails to gain trust, confidence, and support from politics and public (Beto, Corbett, & DiIulio, 2000; Reinventing Probation Council, 2000). In response to this negative assessment, it is essential for probation administrators and managers to be leaders: Only leaders, rather than managers, can formulate an inspiring vision for an effective probation system, and influence and transform probation personnel from a passive into an active participant in building a more effective system, eventually engendering public support and positively promoting public safety.

As a pilot study on leadership in the area of probation, this research began by asking the question of what makes an effective leader. The literature indicates two dominant schools of thought have arisen

concerning how leadership effectiveness can be approached. There is recognition that both leadership style and personality are important attributes to successful leadership. For probation directors, however, the overall results suggested that transformational leadership among the three leadership styles was more important than personality traits in correlating with and predicting leadership success.

Accordingly, leadership style is seen as more important than personality. It appears that this finding is consistent with and confirms the theoretical shift from the personal trait approach to leadership style behavior approach. However, the results indicated that 44% of the variance in leadership success was accounted for by some personalities after controlling for individual status variables, and personalities were found to have their indirect impact on leadership mediated through leadership style. That is, the significant role of personality on leadership success still exists and should not be ignored. Therefore, it is clearly better to incorporate personality into leadership style behavior research in correlating with and predicting leadership success, eventually providing more crucial and useful criteria for personnel selection and placement, and leadership training.

Inconsistent with leadership literature, transactional leadership style has no significant association with leadership success and has no contribution to make in predicting leadership success. Judge and Piccolo (2004) found that contingent reward among the transactional leadership behaviors as well as transformational leadership were significantly correlated with and significantly predicted leadership success. Given the important role of contingent reward, it is recommended that probation administrators recognize the limited opportunities for extrinsic rewards available in public service and strongly consider internal rewards, such as opportunities for professional growth and development to enhance leadership success. This might serve to compensate for extrinsic rewards such as pay and promotion. Initiating in-

trinsic rewards might encourage individual probation personnel to move toward a more effective system to rehabilitate offenders and promote public safety. Despite the importance of transformational leadership over transactional leadership (management), fulfilling the vision *for* and *of* an organization should require both leadership styles. Therefore, transactional leadership should not be ignored by probation administrators.

This exploratory study was the first empirical leadership study in the field of probation. Despite the potentially significant academic and practical contributions, however, it may not be appropriate to generalize findings from the data obtained from the sampled probation directors. Contrary to the aforementioned negative criticism about probation leadership, the overall results suggested that the sampled probation directors have desirable leadership styles and personalities, all contributing to leadership success. It is suspected that there was a degree of selection bias in this study; it is suspected that members of the NAPE are more invested in and more committed to the probation profession than administrators who are not members. Therefore, the findings in this study should be interpreted with caution. In addition, this study is limited to the self-assessment of leadership style and leadership success by the sampled directors. Assessing both leadership style and leadership success should be from the subordinate's perspective since leadership is a social behavioral phenomenon (Conger & Kanungo, 1987).

In response to these two limitations, future research should employ Equal Probability of Selection Method in a geographic specific survey to provide external validity. Also, future research should utilize the rater (subordinates) MLQ form to measure leadership style and leadership success, eventually securing internal validity. Among all four transformational leadership behaviors, Lowe et al. (1996) found the construct Charisma, a combination of idealized influence and inspirational motivation, as a major component of transformational leadership. More recently, Bono and Judge (2004), in their meta-analysis study, found that the construct charisma, a combination of idealized influence and inspirational motivation encapsulated the fundamental nature of transformational leadership behavior and explained much of the variance in leadership success and affirmed the results from the Lowe et al. (1996). Accordingly, future research should utilize nine leadership style behaviors of the MLQ separately to seek for a better indicator in correlating with and predicting leadership success.

Notes

1. As described earlier, four leadership behavioral scales were defined as characteristic of transformational leadership (idealized influence: attributed and behavior, inspirational motivation, individual consideration, and intellectual stimulation). Three behavioral scales were identified as characteristic of transactional leadership (contingent reward, active management-by-exception, and passive management-by-exception). The last behavioral scale was described as non-leadership, also known as laissez-faire leadership.

2. The three subordinate outcome components factored together with an appropriate *eigenvalue* of 2.75—greater than 1.00 through a discontinuity test—and factor loadings all over 0.50, suggesting substantial loadings.

3. Since the MLQ leadership style and outcome inventory is a standardized assessment with its high validity, the laissez-faire leadership was retained, ensuring comparability of the results to other studies using this inventory.

4. Two multicollinearity diagnostics were conducted. First, none of the previous Pearson's correlations among all independent variables were higher than ± 0.7 . The second method of identifying multicollinearity is to examine all individual variation inflation factor (VIF) scores for each individual variable: there was no coefficient with a VIF score exceeding 10. Therefore, multicollinearity is not an issue in this analysis, and does not substantially alter any of the findings or subsequent conclusions drawn from the analysis.

References

- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and Performance beyond Expectations*. New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications* (3rd Ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (2004). *MLQ Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Redwood City, CA, Mind Garden.
- Beto, D. R., Corbett, R. P., & DiIulio, J. J. (2000). Getting serious about probation and the crime problem. *Corrections Management Quarterly*, 4, 1-8.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 901-910.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2009). *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2008*. Washington, D. C.: Office of Justice Programs of U.S. Department of Justice.
- Burn, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York, Harper & Row.
- Carless, S. A. (1998). Assessing the discriminate validity of transformational leadership behavior as measured by the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 71, 353-358.
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 12, 637-647.
- Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO FFI): Professional Manual*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.
- DiIulio, J. J. (1987). *Governing Prisons: A Comparative Study in Correctional Management*. New York: The Free Press.

Executive Exchange

- Dubinsky, A. J., Yammarino, F. J., Jolson, M. A., & Spangler, W. D. (1995). Transformational Leadership: An Initial Investigation in Sales Management. *Journal of Personal Selling and Sales Management, 15*, 17-32.
- Dumdum, U. R., Lowe, K. B., & Avolio, B. J. (2002). A meta-analysis of transformational and transactional leadership correlates of effectiveness and satisfaction: An update and extension. In B. J. Avolio & F. J. Yammarino (Eds.), *Transformational and charismatic leadership: The road ahead* (pp. 35-66). Amsterdam: JAI.
- Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., Anderson, R. L., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis* (6th Ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychology, 49*, 469-477.
- House, R. J. & Aditya, R. N. (1997). The social scientific study of leadership: Quo vadis? *Journal of Management, 23*, 409-473.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1993). Transformational leadership, transactional leadership, locus of control, and support for innovation: Key predictors consolidated business-unit performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 891-902.
- Judge, T. A. & Bono, J. E. (2000). Five-factor model of personality and transformational leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 85*, 751-765.
- Judge, T. A., Bono, J. E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M. W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87*, 765-780.
- Judge, T. A. & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 755-768.
- Kenny, D. A. & Zaccaro, S. J. (1983). An estimate of variance due to traits in leadership. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 68*, 678-685.
- Kirkpatrick, S. A. & Locke, E. A. (1991). Leadership: Do traits matter? *Academy of Management Executive, 5*, 48-60.
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *Leadership Quarterly, 7*, 385-425.
- Maxfield, M., & Babbie, E. (2005). *Research methods for criminal justice and criminology* (4th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Thomson/Wadsworth Publishing.
- Medley, F. & Larochelle, D. R. (1995). Transformational leadership and job satisfaction. *Nursing Management, 26*, 64-69.
- Petersilla, J. (1997). Probation in the United States. In M. Tonry (Ed.), *Crime and Justice: A Review of Research* (pp. 149-200). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Reinventing Probation Council (2000). *Transforming Probation through Leadership: The "Broken Windows" Model*. New York: The Manhattan Institute.
- Silverthorne, C. (2001). Leadership effectiveness and personality: A cross-cultural evaluation. *Personality and individual differences, 30*, 303-309.
- Smith, M. A., & Canger, J. M. (2004). Effects of supervisor "Big Five" personality on subordinate attitudes. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 18*, 465-81.0
- Wiggins, J. S., & Pincus, A. L. (1992). Personality structure and assessment. In: M. R. Rosenzweig & L. W. Porter (Eds.). *Annual Review of Psychology* (vol. 43, pp. 473-504).
- Wofford, J. C., Whittington, J. L., & Goodwin, V. L. (2001). Follower motive patterns as situational moderators for transformational leadership effectiveness. *Journal of Managerial Issues, 9*, 196-211.
- Yammarino, F. & Dubinsky, A. (1994). Transformational leadership theory: Using levels of analysis to determine boundary conditions. *Personal Psychology, 47*, 787-811.

Won-Jae Lee, Ph.D. is an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice at Angelo State University in San Angelo, Texas. He received his Ph.D. in Criminal Justice from Sam Houston State University in 2004. His primary research interests include criminal justice administration, racial profiling, comparative criminal justice system and practices, and policy analysis and program evaluation in criminal justice.

James Phelps, Ph.D. is an Adjunct Professor of Criminal Justice at Angelo State University in San Angelo, Texas. He received his Ph.D. in Criminal Justice from Sam Houston State University in 2008. His primary research interests include comparative and international criminal justice, policy analysis, and program evaluation in criminal justice. He is the author of *What Happened to the Iraqi Police?*, Carolina Academic Press, 2010.

Christie Davidson is Executive Director of the National Association of Probation Executives. She is also Assistant Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas.

Dan Richard Beto is a Senior Fellow at the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario, and Editor of *Executive Exchange*. He is a former President of the National Association of Probation Executives and was the founding Executive Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas.

PARTNERSHIP TO ENHANCE PUBLIC SAFETY: A CANADIAN MODEL

by

Sonya Spencer
and
David Pisapio

Partnerships between government and non-governmental agencies have become increasingly important in order to reduce offender recidivism and thereby increase public safety.

Over the years instrumental partners such as John Howard's Society, Salvation Army, Elizabeth Fry Society, and St. Leonard's Society have, through their associated programs, been viewed as essential components of the Canadian criminal justice system. While these groups remain active today, those involved in the safe and structured transition of offenders back into the community have needed to look to partners for innovative initiatives, whether these are fresh new partnerships aimed at invigorating programs through innovation or seeking new ideas to tackle the perceived gaps in services for those offenders with specialized needs.

This article will outline the current landscape in Canadian federal corrections, identify long standing and emerging challenges, profile a new partnership designed to meet the needs of high risk/high need offenders, and then conclude with the value of partnerships in community corrections.

A Snapshot of Crime and Federal Corrections

According to Canada's police-reported crime rate (PRCR) — which measures the overall volume of crime reported to and by the police — it dropped 5% in 2008 to its lowest level in over 30 years, yet the incarceration rate in Canada has for several years continued to increase by 2% annually. According to the 2007-2008 National Parole Board Performance Monitoring Report during 2007-08, the federal prison population increased to 13,582, and the offenders in the community on some form of conditional release remained relatively stable at 8,434.

The Correctional Service of Canada (CSC) is a department of the federal government responsible for the custody of individuals convicted of crime and sentenced to two years or more. Those sentenced to less than two years are the responsibility of the provincial governments and their correctional services. In addition to the provision of custodial services, CSC is also responsible for the supervision of all offenders released from federal custody. This includes those released on "conditional releases" (including discretionary releases such as temporary absences, day parole, and full parole) as well as "statutory release" (a non-discretionary release at two-thirds of a sentence). CSC is also responsible for the supervision of those under "long term supervision orders" (imposed by the court on certain offenders to commence following the completion of a custodial sentence).

Individuals granted a "discretionary release" have demonstrated positive behaviors within the penitentiary by participating in appropriate programs and following their correctional plan. They have satisfied the decision maker — normally the National Parole Board — that their risk to re-offend is assumable and they can be managed in the community if released from custody to complete their sentence under supervision.

Those who are released on "statutory release" have not convinced the decision makers to grant an earlier form of release or

have not successfully completed a previous discretionary release. However, the "Corrections and Conditional Release Act" (CCRA), the law governing CSC in this respect, stipulates the requirement to release offenders to the community under supervision who have served two thirds of their sentence. The rationale being that it is safer to release offenders into the community on a gradual basis under supervision than releasing them at the very end of their sentences when there is no jurisdiction to monitor their behavior or indeed assist them with their reintegration and resettlement.

In 1994, CSC implemented a national offender intake assessment process aimed at conducting an in-depth assessment of all offenders as they enter the federal correctional system. This process is designed to collect all relevant information on the offender from multiple agencies with which the individual has had contact — namely police, courts, community support agencies, and other key stakeholders. The purpose being to gather as much information as is readily available to fully assess the offender's background, conduct the appropriate risk assessments, as well as conducting a full assessment of holistic needs and potential barriers to both reintegration and reducing reoffending.

We know from this process that the federal population has changed over the past ten years and there are more offenders with violent backgrounds, mental health needs, and gang affiliations. Not only does this make the provision of custodial services more challenging, it increases the challenges for those tasked with supervising these offenders upon their return to the community.

The Corrections and Conditional Release Act of 1996 was amended to allow the National Parole Board to impose a condition of residency on offenders released on statutory release, thereby allowing the parole board to require an offender to reside in a community based residential facility that will closely monitor the offender's access to the community. The number of cases with this condition has steadily increased since the amendment to the law. Originally, it was felt that the imposition of this condition would be for those few offenders that represent an increased risk upon release. However, the test in the law states that the offender must be assessed against the following criteria: "in the absence of the residency condition, the offender will present an undue risk to society by committing an offence listed in Schedule I (violent offences) before the expiration of the offender's sentence according to law."

This means that the National Parole Board must be satisfied that the offender meets the criteria when imposing the condition to reside in a community based residential facility. In addition, an amendment to the Criminal Code and the CCRA in 1999 added a new provision for the courts to impose an order on individuals convicted of certain offences to be subject to long term supervision following the completion of the custodial portion of their sentences. The amendment to the CCRA allowed the National Parole Board to impose a residency condition on these offenders as well.

On April 20, 2007, the Honorable Stockwell Day, then Minister of Public Safety, announced the appointment of an independent panel, known as the Transformation Team, to review CSC's

Executive Exchange

operations as part of the Government's commitment to protecting Canadian families and communities. The Panel was asked to look at specific aspects of CSC and to prepare a report with recommendations.

Commissioner Don Head summarized some of the findings of the Transformation Team in his *Let's Talk* article. "Building On A Strong Foundation: The Way Forward," (Vol. 33, No. 1) as follows:

The Panel members started by acknowledging the efforts of CSC staff and others in their contribution to public safety, noting "... the hard work and professionalism of CSC staff, NGOs and volunteers ... remains largely unseen by Canadians." Building on this strong foundation, the Panel then identified a number of areas where CSC should refine or re-focus some of its efforts in order to strengthen its public safety contribution.

There was also consensus among the Panel members that an empirical-based approach to the delivery of correctional services is key to the safe reintegration of offenders back into the community. This includes having:

- a robust and timely intake assessment process;
- a correctional planning process that is supported by an integrated education, programs, and employment and employability strategy;
- a focused approach for transitioning inmates to the community; and
- a strong community corrections capacity to provide supervision and surveillance, as well as intervention opportunities for offenders as they progress to their warrant expiry date and return to the community as law-abiding citizens.

The Central Ontario Parole District

As a result of the above legislated changes and the changing offender profile, there has been an increase in the numbers of cases being released on statutory release. In keeping with the risk principle, (reserving more intensive services for those offenders representing the highest risk), the Central Ontario Parole District of the Correctional Service of Canada implemented an intensive supervision practice in Toronto. The unit (Team Supervision) operates with teams of two parole officers supervising offenders released on statutory release representing a higher risk to re-offend. The parole officers work closely with the offender and service providers to ensure the offender's needs are met and that there is close monitoring of the offender's behavior. Curfews are imposed and weekly in-person checks are conducted to ensure that the curfew is being adhered to. This has assisted in managing the higher risk offenders.

Last year the district also implemented electronic monitoring to assist with supervising offenders representing a higher risk. Given the changing nature of the population, this tool has provided enhanced capacity to monitor the offender's activities within the community through limiting their access to certain locations and closely monitoring curfews imposed.

Since the amendment to the CCRA legislation, the residency requirements have been on a steady increase. In the Central Ontario District of CSC in 2008/2009, 36% of offenders released on statutory release had a residency condition. This has put pres-

ures on the residential capacity of the district. The district has two federally run residential facilities (Community Correctional Centers – CCC) with a total of 65 beds. There are also contracts with several community agencies providing residential services (Community Residential Facilities – CRF) for a total of 241 beds. With the increase in residency conditions imposed on offenders released on statutory release and long term supervision orders, the 65 CCC beds have been devoted totally to this population. Once providing residential beds for offenders on temporary absences or day parole, these facilities have become residential space for only statutory release cases and long term supervision orders with residency conditions. As a result, there has been a need to rely on the private agencies under contract to assist in managing these cases within their residential facilities. Given the fact that these cases are being released by law on their statutory release date, the Correctional Service of Canada has no choice but to supervise them upon their release from incarceration. There is no option with these cases to remain incarcerated until a bed becomes available since the date of release is established in law. If there is a condition to reside imposed by the National Parole Board, the Service has no option but to locate residential space for the day of release.

This has become an issue for the Central Ontario District since the beds available in the district are operating at full capacity. Efforts have been made to ensure that all options are considered prior to submitting the case to the National Parole Board where a residency condition may be considered. Since the law authorizing the imposition of a condition states that "in the absence of residency, the offender will commit an offence," it is necessary to consider all options to residency prior to submitting the case to the Board for a decision. As a result, the Central Ontario District has presented alternatives such as the Team Supervision Unit and electronic monitoring to the National Parole Board as option to residency. However, increased options are required as the rates of residency conditions continue to be high.

The Correctional Service has recognized that it cannot continue to manage the increased demands of the population on its own. The need for enhanced supervision practices has become evident with the changing offender profile and the need to provide additional assistance and monitoring to achieve successful reintegration of the offenders. In addition, the partnership with community agencies assists with the overall reintegration of offenders into the community and maximizes the availability of community services to assist with the reintegration process. As a result, the Service has partnered with St. Leonard's Society of Toronto to operate a Day Reporting Center to augment the supervision offered by CSC.

Crossroads Day Reporting Center

Since 1976, St. Leonard's Society of Toronto (SLST) has been offering programs and services geared towards enhancing community safety. Specifically, the Crossroads Program (CP) is aimed at assisting individuals with prior involvement in the criminal justice system to develop the skills necessary to live as law-abiding citizens.

With community corrections programs adopting a proactive stance, SLST has followed suit; a newly formed partnership with Correctional Service of Canada has allowed SLST to expand its continuum of care through the establishment of the Crossroads Day Reporting Center (CDRC).

The Development Phase

As noted in the CSC 2008-2009 Reports on Plans and Priorities, "Effective management of the more challenging and complex offender population requires new training and equipment for staff, an increase in specialized services — most notably in the provision of mental health care for offenders — and more distinct and targeted interventions, all of which result in the need for additional resources. Moreover, with a greater proportion of offenders serving sentences of less than three years, CSC is faced with having less time than previously to deliver correctional programming and other necessary interventions." SLST recognized the need to assist CSC in the effective management of this offender profile and since residential programs were difficult to site and did not represent the "least restrictive measure" the focus turned to non-residential services.

In view of CSC's focus on the transformation agenda we considered how the CDRC model would reflect these priorities. Our conclusions are noted below:

Priority — Offender Accountability: The CDRC offers a structured, assessment driven individualized plan for all participating offenders. The panel's philosophy regarding accountability, as noted in the CSC Review Panel Report, is the belief that if rehabilitation is to occur and be truly sustained, it must be shared by CSC and the offender.

SLST believes the CDRC supports this belief by ensuring that the level of intervention is matched to the offender's risk/needs level while considering responsibility issues. The case manager's use of motivational interviewing techniques to encourage offender "buy in" then shifts the accountability to the offender. This is evidenced by their need to actively participate in the program components.

Priority — Employability/Employment: As noted in the *Roadmap to Strengthening Public Safety* (2007), "a current snapshot of the employment needs of the federal prison population taken at intake assessment identified that more than 70% of offenders at admission had unstable work histories; more than 70% had not completed high school and more than 60% had no trade or skill knowledge."

As we experience an economic downturn, the area of employability/employment has become a critical and comprehensive component of the CDRC program with individualized counseling as well as access to computer stations.

CDRC Case Managers work closely in partnership with Corcan Employment Counselors to ensure the services are not only complimentary but comprehensive.

Priority — Enhanced Community Supervision Capacity: As the CDRC is a non-residential program, we strongly believe that, if utilized appropriately, the CDRC will increase the bed capacity within the Central District Region by reducing the number of residency conditions imposed or supported.

Due to the sound program rationale and the identified need for this model of programming the CDRC program opened its doors on October 1, 2008.

Program Outline

The goals of the CDRC are:

- 1) Enhance community safety and decrease victimization through the reduction of offender recidivism;

- 2) Improve the ability of offenders to lead pro-social lifestyles through the development and implementation of individualized goal plans within a non-residential program;
- 3) Provide a cost effective alternative to offender incarceration for those deemed manageable in the community; and
- 4) Collaborate with local agencies to increase and expedite the supports and services offered to offenders reintegrating into the community.

In an effort to achieve these aims, the CDRC offers increased accountability and regular observation (daily if required) alongside counseling to support offenders with correctional plan compliance, including such interventions as additional employment and substance abuse counseling. These services are made available to high risk offenders leaving correctional institutions or currently under community supervision, as it has been identified that such persons have several unresolved issues impeding successful re-integration.

The CDRC strategy reflects best practices of the "what works" literature in the field of effective community correctional rehabilitation and incorporates the subsequent components:

- The use of the Level of Service Inventory-Revised (LSI-R) instrument to assess the criminogenic risk, and need factors affecting the offender's involvement in criminal behavior;
- Development of a case plan that is responsive to the criminogenic factors identified in the assessment process, which includes the LSI-R and other objective information (e.g., home environment, offender self identified interest areas and CSC reports generated throughout the institutional phases of their sentence) and that also addresses goals that are specific to the offenders non-criminogenic factors related to successful community reintegration;
- Referral to the appropriate array of intervention/treatment, education, vocational and other services to assist the offenders in developing the new skills required to be a pro-social community member;
- Use of the CDRC sessions to assist the offender to learn the triggers (e.g., people, places or situation, and corresponding information processing) that affect involvement in criminal behavior; and
- Timely communication with the offender to review progress on the case management plan and achievement of goals/objectives.

The CDRC is being used or considered for the following offender profiles:

- Offenders currently under review for the imposition of a residency condition;
- Offenders being considered for the removal of a residency condition;
- Offenders in need of heightened supervision or support during a period of re-stabilization and suspension is not viewed as the least restrictive measure to manage increased level of risk;
- Offenders who are traveling into the Greater Toronto Area that may require an increased level of supervision/monitoring; and

Executive Exchange

- Offenders currently participating in the electronic monitoring pilot who need increased or enhanced levels of support.

The CDRC operates seven days per week from 1200 hours to 2000 hours. It is staffed by two full-time case managers and support staff. The CDRC is a storefront operation located in the east end of Toronto. Reporting appointments are pre-scheduled with one of the two designated case managers, based on the completed referral process and subject to availability.

Typically, offenders are required to report in person at a minimum frequency of three times per week. This frequency may be modified at the discretion of the case management team.

Case consultation occurs between CSC and CDRC no less than once weekly, supported by a written summary by the CDRC case manager immediately following each reporting contact. The CDRC case manager notifies CSC as soon as possible (and in writing) within 24 hours regarding any indication of an increased risk to re-offend, or of any violation(s) of a condition of release or an offender's failure to attend a scheduled appointment.

Worldwide Best Practice to Help Deliver Effective Partnerships

As part of SLST's commitment to effective partnership working, the organization has also been examining programmes worldwide for examples in best practice. SLST has consulted with practitioners in the United States and the United Kingdom on programs, such as the European Social Fund/Learning and Skills Council project "Skills for Jobs: Offenders in the Community" in England where multiple partners — including the Prison Service, Leaf, and NACRO — work together to achieve significant employment and intervention results for those being released to the community from custody.

Beginning with pre-employment training in custody, a similar collaboration with local agencies exists to increase support services offered to offenders reintegrating into the community. When supported by an active job search mechanism and case worker involvement this provides a wraparound service aimed at offering individual support to offenders at their time of most need (directly upon release). The continuity of care is also maintained through case workers who engage with individuals on both sides of the prison walls, thereby maximizing levels of support.

CDRC Program Logic Model

| Goals & Objectives | Target Population | Resources | Activities | Outcomes and Impacts | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | | | | Short Term/ Intermediate | Long Term |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhance community safety and decrease victimization through reduction in recidivism among offenders • Enhance the ability of offenders to lead pro-social lives through individualized assessment and goal setting • Provide a cost-effective alternative to offender incarceration/residency for those deemed manageable in the community | Moderate-high risk/high needs offenders: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative to residency • Deteriorating behavior under community supervision • Community strategy component upon discharge from institution • Enhanced services to compliment community parole supervision | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Budget • 2 full time case managers • 1 full time community resource facilitator • Multiple computer stations/ fax machine/ printer for offender use • <i>Community resources including:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -housing agencies -social services agencies -mental health agencies -substance abuse treatment/ information centers -education/ apprenticeship programs • "CDRC Toolbox": <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -standardized risk/ need instruments (LSI-R) -CSC files -Collaterals | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review referrals to ensure suitability for the program • <i>Intake including:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Risk/Need assessment -Case management planning -Establishment of case management goals and development of case management plan • Motivational interviewing • One-to-one counseling • Follow through as per case management plan • Ongoing review of case management plan • Ongoing review of goals and progress • Advocacy when necessary • Consultation with parole officer and other collaterals • Timely referral to appropriate community-based agencies • Crisis counseling • Individual case documentation • Team case conferencing • Discharge planning and preparation for warrant expiry • Follow-up post-WED for evaluation purposes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of referrals • Length of stay in program • Number of meetings with case manager • Employment • Enrollment in educational or apprenticeship program • Stable housing • Negative urinalysis • Compliance with parole conditions • Active participation in the CDRC • Completion of CSC programming • Pro-social attitude as reflected by behavior/ activities and associations • Positive movement in assessed dynamic needs | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reaching warrant expiry date as active participant in CDRC • Successful reintegration/ transition to community as reflected by community stabilization • Attainment of goals established in case management planning phase • Maintenance of gains made in dynamic need areas • Maintenance of pro-social lifestyle |

A Year in Review

In view of the fact that (a) the CDRC officially opened its doors October 1, 2008, (b) November 19, 2008, marked the first client admitted to CDRC, and (c) the outreach required to inform and educate local Parole Officers regarding the services offered by the CDRC, it is too early to decipher the targeted impacts of the program, i.e., the underlying objectives of CDRC. Upon the completion of Year II and III, it is projected that a substantial amount of data will exist, allowing the CDRC to adequately determine the effects of its services in relation to the success of each offender as he/she attempts to reintegrate into the community.

The data available to the CDRC at this stage is based on the number of referrals, referral sources, the risk/need areas as identified by way of LSI-R, and collateral sources of information. At the very least, such data offers CDRC a baseline for future analysis. A secondary source of information derived from feedback, as provided by offenders receiving CDRC services, parole officer referrals, and comments made by members of the National Parole Board to CDRC.

Listed below are some early findings following one year of service delivery:

- 12 offenders have successfully reached their warrant expiry date with the assistance of the CDRC.
- 19% of those offenders who had a residency condition when referred to the CDRC have since had the condition removed.
- 92% of those offenders recommended to participate in the CDRC as an alternative to residency and were referred to the CDRC in advance of release have been granted a release without a residency condition.
- The CDRC has been used as an additional resource for 26% of those offenders participating in the Electronic Monitoring Program within the Central District Region.
- To date, the CDRC has accepted all referrals into the program and would only deny participation to those deemed to be an imminent threat to staff or other offenders (incompatibility issues), those not assessed as high need or those expressing an ongoing resistance to active participation.
- The general characteristics of offenders being referred to the CDRC have been consistent with the intended program concept. The original program design and the adhering to evidence based practices (Gendreau, et al., 2004), indicated that those deemed at higher risk/need levels receive this intensive service. All referrals made by parole officers indicate that their assessment of the offender being referred is in the high risk, high needs range. Following the intake process and completion of the LSI-R not all those referred have in fact been assessed as high risk. However, 100% of those accepted into the program have been assessed as having high needs.
- Employment/Education is the most prominent need domain identified followed by substance abuse. Many of the identified need domains are further complicated by having few community supports and currently living in high risk neighborhoods. The CDRC will address all presenting areas posing difficulty to the successful reintegration of the offender.
- The CDRC program outline states that an offender must remain on site for a minimum of 20 minutes per reporting

session. In the first year the average session length was 1 hour and 15 minutes.

- 39% of participating offenders have utilized the crisis counseling offered by the case managers via cellular phone.

The concept of a transitional service such as provided by SLST's CDRC is a critical component on the evidenced based community correctional continuum. The CDRC offers case management support, enhances accountability of the offender through regular observation, and provides counseling that supports the offender's correctional plan. This deliberate combination increases the possibilities of compliance to the conditions of supervision.

The counseling support offered by the CDRC is diverse, client centered and holistic. It can accommodate the needs of a diverse population and has established numerous community partnerships to facilitate this work. One of the most challenging aspects remains working with those whom have a diagnosed mental illness however community partnerships in this area continue to grow.

Next Steps

The CDRC has proven to have a positive impact on the clients it serves and ultimately increasing public safety. As a result CSC and SLST are looking to expand the program to meet the needs of the entire Central Ontario Parole District with satellite offices in the east and west ends of Toronto. In addition, Day Reporting Centers of varying sizes have begun in smaller communities in the Province of Ontario. The current collaboration between CSC and SLST has demonstrated effectiveness and is pleased to be leading the charge with this exciting programming alternative within community corrections.

In Donald G. Evans' (1999) article, "Partners: The Voluntary Sector and Corrections," he highlights three examples of governmental and voluntary agencies working collaboratively to stretch beyond the boundaries of their own organizations and work with others to achieve goals that could not be accomplished alone. His article was authored in 1999 yet the CDRC is an example of how this partnering continues today. We are very fortunate in Canada to have built a strong working collaborative structure within community corrections that encourages innovation.

Matt Logan, writing in the *Journal of Community Corrections*, in his article "From Check In to Check Out" (2008) states that "It is easy to use the terms 'Resettlement' or 'Re-entry' to summarize a complex process involving multiple agencies or organizations, but the process itself is one of the most individually complex elements of working with offenders. The needs of the individual must be directly matched to the opportunities presented within the community and sign-posted effectively to facilitate a more cohesive delivery." He also points out that the process of resettlement/re-entry runs the risk of becoming a process which is "done to someone rather than *with* someone" thereby demonstrating the need to work in partnership with the needs of the offender at the heart of all activity.

In conclusion, the CDRC highlights the value of partnership; however, we must continue to seek out further opportunities to strengthen community partnerships. By developing partnerships with agencies, communities, police and other governmental sectors we can enhance staff and offender safety, security, and the effectiveness of the programs delivered to offenders. St. Leonard's Society has been very fortunate to have built a strong commun-

Executive Exchange

ity constituency, including the endorsement of the local police; however, the need for the CDRC to expand its partners has also become evident in order to provide a seamless support network for released offenders.

Great advancement has been made to ensure there is a continuum of programming and services available to the offender when transitioning from the institution although work continues to be needed in bridging the offender and their neighbourhood to ensure long-term community stability.

References

Sampson, R., S. Gascon, I. Glen, C. Louie, S. Rosenfeldt (2007). *Report of the Correctional Service of Canada Review Panel: A Roadmap to Strengthening Public Safety*, (October).

Gendreau, Paul, et al. (2006). "The Theory of Effective Correctional Interventions: Empirical Status & Future Directions," in *Taking Stock: The Status of Criminology Theory*. Piscataway: Transaction Press.

Head, Don (2008). "Building a Strong Foundation: The Way Forward," *Let's Talk*, Volume 33, No. 1, May.

Evans, Donald G. (1999). "Partners: The Voluntary Sector and Corrections," *Perspectives*, Fall.

Logan, Matt (2008). "From Check-In to Check Out," *Journal of Community Corrections*, Summer.

Sonya Spencer is Executive Director of St. Leonard's Society of Toronto and President-Elect of the International Community Corrections Association.

David Pisapio is District Director of the Central Region of Ontario, Correctional Services of Canada.

INFORMATION ABOUT EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

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

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

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

electronically to probation.executives@gmail.com or by conventional mail to:

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

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

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

NAPE LISTSERV AND WEBSITE

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

At present there are over 200 members registered on the NAPE Listserv. Members who are not receiving this service but wish to should send an email to [\[gmail.com\]\(mailto:probation.executives@gmail.com\), indicating a desire to be added to the NAPE Listserv. In addition, members who would like to update their email addresses, or add a second email address, should feel free to do so.](mailto:probation.executives@</p></div><div data-bbox=)

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

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

NEW HORIZONS: ICPA BARBADOS CONFERENCE

by

Donald G. Evans

On October 25-30, 2009, I enjoyed the warmth of the Barbados sun and the fellowship of like minded correctional professionals who had gathered for the 11th Annual General Meeting and Conference of the International Corrections and Prisons Association (ICPA) to share experiences, program innovations, and research results from over 50 different countries.

The program offerings were many and choosing what to focus one's attention on was a difficult task. As is usual when confronted with this multi-choice problem, I as anyone else might do selected the areas of my current interests: probation, risk management, re-entry programs, and women's imprisonment. What follows is my recollection and reflections on these topics as they were presented in the sessions I attended, and in the case of probation — not a major feature of the conference unfortunately — the result of meeting with probation staff and interviewing them about their work.

Reflection on "I am not now who I used to be then"

Distinguished Professor Emeritus Hans Toch from the State University of New York at Albany in the United States presented this year's distinguished scholar's lecture at the ICPA Conference held in Bridgetown, Barbados. I found this lecture to be a very profound and fundamentally common sense comment on current practices of assessing risk and only paying lip service to the concept of change or the possibilities of change in an offender's behavior.

Toch challenged the conference delegates to consider release decisions regarding long-term prisoners to involve the psychological transformation of maturing offenders. In other words, Toch suggests that we consider their movements from volatility to stability, from impulsivity to self-control, and the abandonment of a self-centered perspective to a development of empathy, concern, and interest in other people. If we are interested in reducing re-offending by long-term prisoners, we cannot rely on current risk assessments that are heavily weighted to past criminal histories but we, he noted, ought to encourage any and all meaningful and constructive behaviors among long-term prisoners and to credit them when they occur. He concluded his speech with a quote from Richard McGee, a former Director of the California correctional system, who in 1957 told new employees, of which Toch was one, the following:

Every employee, we don't care what his classification . . . has a responsibility to deal with the emotional and personal problems of the people . . . under his supervision . . . He has the responsibility of creating an atmosphere within the institution in which people can grow and develop.

Toch ended his speech by telling us that if we wish to be proud of our profession "we cannot afford to relinquish the objective of nurturing personal growth and human development, because if we did that, we would be left running warehouses for people." This admonition is, I believe, also worthy of consideration by

probation and parole officers and personnel staffing residential facilities.

Re-Entry Issues

It was interesting and informative to listen to officials from the Barbadian Government discuss two concerns related to the re-entry of offenders in the community: the problem of a criminal record and the lack of adequate transitional housing and services. Related to the first concern, the Deputy Prime Minister and Attorney-General Freundel Stuart advised the conference delegates that he was revisiting the current Criminal Records and Rehabilitation of Offenders Act with a view to increase the scope of the present expunging of records provisions to allow more former prisoners to benefit from these provisions. He is also studying the possibility of introducing parole to the Barbados but wants to make sure that adequate resources for supervision can be available.

Kim Ramsay, a senior research officer with the National Task Force on Crime Prevention, spoke of the intention to create an Office for the Resettlement of Offenders that would have as its main goal the re-entry transitional and reintegration programs that will bridge the gap between prison and the community. It is proposed that this be a place where offenders can go to get the support and assistance they need to survive and thrive in the community. This office would address the obstacles to re-entry such as employment, substance abuse treatment, housing, family reintegration, and health issues. The proposed approach envisions provision for a residential facility and a day treatment center.

These presentations are constant reminders that the issues of reducing reoffending are similar from jurisdiction to jurisdiction, from one country to another, and that the solutions do not vary very much. Also, not unique to each country is the lack of resources to deal with resettlement issues.

Gender Sensitivity in Global Penal Systems

The Thai Princess, Her Royal Highness Bajrakitiyabba Mahidol, in her address noted that many penal systems in the world are not gender sensitive and, as a result, not enough is being done to consider the specific needs and circumstances of imprisoned women. The Princess has been leading her government's efforts to propose changes to the United Nations 1955 Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners with the object to remedy deficiencies related to women's imprisonment. She urged participants to encourage their governments to support the amendments at the United Nations Congress on Crime and the Treatment of the Offender being held in Brazil in 2010.

The Princess advised the delegates of the specific concerns she felt needed to be addressed in the minimum rules. These concerns included: the need for special provisions for mothers to feed their infants; special facilities for young children to be with or visit their mothers; specific healthcare services; proper provision of hygienic materials; and programs for substance abuse treatment

Executive Exchange

as well as proper security measures that ensure the privacy and dignity of women prisoners are respected.

Her speech and her passion for the cause she is championing was a highlight of the conference. It is hoped that her efforts to mobilize support for the better treatment of women prisoners is successful, not just in draft United Nations documents but in the prison systems of the world!

Probation in the Barbados

One of the values of attending an ICPA conference is the opportunity to network with other correctional professionals and expand your knowledge of how another country addresses the problems and challenges you face back home. The fact the ICPA holds its meetings in different countries and attracts attendees from over fifty countries makes the opportunity for this form of exchange accessible and a natural part of the week's activities. While attending the conference I was able to meet with probation staff from the Probation Service of Barbados and gain information and insight into how they manage their workload, and develop an appreciation of the challenges they face.

I met with Dorita Lovelle, Chief Probation Officer, and two of her staff, Stellar Scantlebury and Sandra Green, for a very interesting and informative discussion about probation in the Barbados. According to Chief Lovelle, the service was established in 1946 and operated under the Probation Offenders Act, 1945-46. The trajectory of probation in Barbados follows the general history of most early probation services by starting in the community with non-governmental support and usually from the religious sector. In the case of the Barbados, the initial probation service was operated by the Salvation Army, which played an important role in organizing the probation system. By 1950 the service had a staff complement comprised of a Chief Probation Officer with three officers.

Today the service is a government agency connected to the Ministry of Home Affairs and has a staff complement of 27 employees that includes management, supervisory, and support staff. They operate out of an office in Bridgetown with responsibility to provide service in nine District Courts. The legal framework for the work of probation in Barbados is contained in seven specific pieces of legislation. Acts covering juvenile offenders, probation offenders (adults), maintenance, adoption, family law, prison welfare, after-care, and, most recently, penal system reform.

In our discussion Chief Lovelle and her staff outlined for me the various functions that the probation department are responsible for under the various legislations that direct their work in the courts and the community. The mandated functions cover the following areas: reports, especially social inquires and means inquires; supervision of offenders placed on probation; advice to the courts; act as guardian *ad litem* in adoption cases; chief or deputy acts as secretary to the prison after-care committee; counseling services within the prison and acts as a liaison between the prison and the offenders family; involvement in access to welfare and in the custody of children; and supervision of offenders serving community service orders.

In most probation services there is always a category of other duties and functions that need to be responded to because the need in the community exceeds the boundaries of mandated services and the Probation Service of Barbados is not exempt from this tendency. They are involved, according to Chief Lovelle and staff, in a large number of voluntary calls on service either

through walk-ins to the office or referrals from other social service agencies. Typically these service demands are for youth with behavioral problems, general complaints, domestic disputes, and continuing to work with offenders who have completed their probation orders or after-care supervision but still have needs that have to or should be addressed. In terms of the department's approach to inventions, the service starts with an assessment of the offender's needs and risks. The LSI-R is used and all of the staff has received training in the use of this instrument. The programs and interventions use are informed by the needs indicated in the assessment and are evidence-based practices. It appeared to me that probation in the Barbados has a strong social work emphasis and it was refreshing to listen to discussions of clients needs and not always stressing the risks they present!

The challenges facing the Probation Service of Barbados sound similar to most probation services in the majority of countries that I have visited or have read about. For example, the problem of workload pressures and lack of resources is basically a universal theme when probation leaders get together. The issue of unsympathetic responses from the public and the criminal justice system is another common theme in probation circles.

In terms of specific supervision difficulties, I was informed that the following were some of the challenges probation officers are currently facing: resistance to reporting (it seems that the offenders are not accustomed or habituated to this form of structure and it presents a constant challenge); health issues; employment opportunities for offenders; unsupportive families, especially in work with juveniles; welfare benefits as they apply to offenders; and accommodation needs.

In an effort to address the issues of resources and of the specific needs of offenders, the staff of the probation service in Barbados realize the need to develop networks of support and where possible partnerships with other agencies and organizations in the community. They have also found that their work is greatly enhanced through collaboration with these other social agencies and institutions that include the welfare department, child care board, the drug rehabilitation unit, and the psychiatric hospital.

In terms of future directions, the service is looking to the prospect of an expansion of their role that would include supervision of parolees. Parole is one of the items under consideration at the cabinet level of the Barbados Government as a result of the Penal Reform Action Report. There are currently no halfway houses in Barbados and the use of attendance or reporting centers is currently on hold. It seems that there are a lot of possibilities for the expansion of supervisory responsibilities that could be adequately and appropriately delivered by the probation department of the Barbados.

I was impressed by their dedication and knowledge of probation work and their enthusiasm. My exchange with Chief Lovelle and Officers Green and Scantlebury was for me one of the highlights of the conference and their outlook underscored ICPA'S New Horizons theme.

Donald G. Evans is a Senior Fellow at the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Canada. He is a Past President of the American Probation and Parole Association. In addition, he is a member of the International Committee of the National Association of Probation Executives and is a contributing editor for *Executive Exchange*.

FROM THE BOOKSHELF

Book reviews found in this issue of *Executive Exchange* have been contributed by Donald G. Evans and Dan Richard Beto.

Donald G. Evans, a Senior Fellow with the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario, is a member of the International Committee and Publications Committee of the National Association of Probation Executives. He is a past President of the American Probation and parole Association and the International Community Corrections Association.

Dan Richard Beto, Editor of *Executive Exchange* and Chair of the International Committee of the National Association of Probation Executives, is a Senior Fellow with the Canadian Training Institute. He is a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives and was the founding Executive Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas.

Executive Exchange welcomes reviews of books and periodicals dealing with community corrections, correctional policy, research and evaluations of correctional programs, and management and leadership issues.

CANADIAN STREET GANGS

A review of *Young Thugs: Inside the Dangerous World of Canadian Street Gangs*, by Michael C. Chettleburgh, Harper Collins, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, 2007, pp. 276 (hardcover).

Visiting bookstores recently I have found a number of books devoted to the issues of gangs, especially youth gangs with a sprinkling of offerings on organized crime gangs. Whether in the United Kingdom or the United States the issues of gangs seems to be a hot topic and both journalists and academics are writing about gangs and the threat they pose to public safety. Michael C. Chettleburgh has turned his attention to this phenomenon in Canada and in *Young Thugs: Inside the Dangerous World of Canadian Street Gangs* provides a useful overview of the problem and makes some interesting observations on what could or should be done to address this growing menace to public safety.

The book is organized into two sections. In section one he deals with the lure of the street gang. In this part he has five chapters covering the main issues such as how gangs have taken root in Canada, the role of females in gangs, guns and gangs, popular culture and the glamorization of gangs and what I found to be a very interesting chapter on street-gang economics. His analysis is clear and the writing easy to read. There are apt descriptions and stories to illustrate the analysis which make the descriptive part of this book useful and helpful to educators, parents and criminal justice workers.

The second section of the book deals with perspective aspects of the confronting and controlling street gangs. In the five chapters assigned to this section the author examines how the police investigate and suppress street gangs, the problem of gangs in the correctional system, prevention strategies, and an interesting if controversial discussion of drug legalization and the reduction of street gangs. His closing chapter explores the important role parents and the home environment can play in keeping children safe from street gangs.

In closing his book, Chettleburgh makes some rather distressing and pessimistic pronouncements, for example "street gangs and their members are here to stay," and will be part of our reality "despite the best efforts of police to suppress them, of courts to punish them and of communities to prevent them." He feels that the current trends in public policy will only exacerbate the problem. Fortunately he doesn't end the book without suggesting a way out for families and the tenth chapter is a good description of the role of parenting and what to do if your child gets involved in gangs.

The author makes clear that gangs are not easily dealt with by the usual political view that the problem is an export and if only

we could control guns from being smuggled into the country Canada could remain the peaceable kingdom. Chettleburgh's book contributes to the important need to wake up and face reality. Canadian gangs are home grown and the causes are multiple and therefore the solutions will of necessity be multi-disciplined and involve more than law enforcement and the justice system. To reiterate the author believes that prevention, early intervention, effective parenting and realistic opportunities are part of the solution to this complex and growing problem. The book is a welcomed addition the growing library of books on gangs.

Donald G. Evans

PRESIDENTIAL LEADERSHIP QUALITIES

Review of *The Leadership of George Bush: An Insider's View of the Forty-First President*, by Roman Popadiuk, Texas A&M University Press, College Station, Texas, 2009, pp. 227 (hardcover).

George H. W. Bush, who served honorably as the 41st President of the United States, devoted his entire life to public service. In *The Leadership of George Bush: An Insider's View of the Forty-First President*, Roman Popadiuk, Executive Director of the George Bush Presidential Library Foundation, examines the leadership qualities of the former President and how they served him and this country during his exemplary career.

Popadiuk, like the subject of his book, has an impressive résumé in public service. He joined the U. S. Foreign Service in 1981, a year after earning a doctorate from the City University of New York. From 1982 to 1984, he served in Mexico City, where he performed consular and political work and was special assistant to the Ambassador. From 1984 to 1986, he served a tour of duty with the Department of State and the National Security Council. In President Ronald Reagan's administration, Popadiuk served as an Assistant Press Secretary from July 1986 until March 1988, when he became Special Assistant to the President and Deputy Press Secretary for Foreign Affairs. In October of that year, the President appointed him a Deputy Assistant. In January 1989, newly elected President George H. W. Bush appointed Popadiuk to be Deputy Assistant to the President and Deputy Press Secretary for Foreign Affairs. He served as the first U. S. Ambassador to independent Ukraine from 1992 to 1993. From 1993 to 1995 Popadiuk was on the faculty of the State Department's Foreign Service Institute. In August 1995 he assumed the duties of International Affairs Advisor and senior civilian on the staff of the

Commandant of the Industrial College of the Armed Forces at Fort McNair, a position he held through the summer of 1998. Commencing in January 1999, he began his service as Executive Director of the George Bush Presidential Library Foundation.

In *The Leadership of George Bush*, the author has produced an insightful and easily read book, in which he identifies Bush's leadership qualities and how they shaped his decision-making process and the manner in which he conducted himself.

After providing a very brief biography of Bush in the first chapter, Popadiuk reveals and discusses the four values that influenced his character — faith, family, friends, and commitment to service.

In chapter two, the author presents the former President's "Rules of Behavior," which are as follows:

1. Don't get down when your life takes a bad turn. Out of adversity comes challenge and often success.
2. Don't blame others for your setbacks.
3. When things go well, always give credit to others.
4. Don't talk all the time. Listen to your friends and mentors and learn from them.
5. Don't brag about yourself. Let others point out your virtues, your strong points.
6. Give someone else a hand. When a friend is hurting, show that you care.
7. Nobody likes an overbearing big shot.
8. As you succeed, be kind to people.
9. Don't be afraid to shed a tear when your heart is broken because a friend is hurting.
10. Say your prayers!

These "Rules of Behavior" are followed by Bush's "Rules of Management" as identified by Popadiuk; they are as follows:

Standing up for your beliefs;
Telling the unvarnished truth;
Loyalty;
Expecting mistakes and admitting your own;
Communication;
Giving credit to others;
Showing your human side;
Realizing that all actions have consequences; and
Ensuring that everyone has a role and knows what it is.

In the remaining seven chapters the author amplifies on Bush's character and "rules" and weaves them into how he organized the White House and how they impacted his governance style. Too, discussion is devoted to communications and media relations, the world of diplomacy, Bush's relationship with Congress, managing the economy, and the campaign of 1992.

Whether or not one agrees with his politics, it cannot be denied that George H. W. Bush was an honorable man who devoted his life to public service, and that by studying his personal traits and beliefs can be instructive. Persons interested in politics and leadership would find *The Leadership of George Bush* a rewarding read.

With this book Roman Popadiuk has made a significant contribution to the study of political science and leadership.

Dan Richard Beto

VIOLENT PLACES, VIOLENT PEOPLE

A review of *The Culture of Prison Violence* by James M. Byrne, Don Hummer, and Faye S. Taxman, Pearson Education, Boston, 2008, pp. 219 (paperback).

With society's continuing reliance on incarceration as the primary weapon against criminal behavior, it is important to assess what exactly happens in prison environments. Todd Clear in his foreword to this book notes that the authors are concerned "with the problem posed by the contemporary prison: too violent, too likely to lead to failure." For him this book is an attempt "to change practice, to make prisons different." The authors have brought together a number of studies from researchers in the United States and the United Kingdom to address the issue of violent places creating violent people. There is a need for serious examination of the culture of prisons and the role that organizational culture plays in the regimes that are created to maintain control and manage the prison population. This look at the connection between offender, staff, and management culture, prison and community culture, and violence is the focus and intent of the editors.

The book consists of ten chapters covering various aspects of the problem of culture, violence, and what works to reduce violence in prisons and change the behavior of the offender while in prison, but especially when released to the community. In the first chapter the editors provide an overview that includes a brief revisionist history of prison reform, a summary of the chapters that follow, and comments on an agenda for change. For them this agenda includes a demand for transparency, use of evidence-based practices, and measuring the moral performance of the prison.

In chapter one Byrne and Hummer address the issue of the nature and extent of prison violence. This is not a pretty picture, and is complicated because of the lack of a standardized data collection system. There will continue to be arguments and disagreements about the nature and extent of prison violence and disorder until such a system is in place.

Chapter two by Stowell and Byrne explores the reciprocal relationship between the community and prison culture. They comment on the differing definitions of culture and present a new cultural paradigm that they feel has promise: the "culture in action" typology. They conclude that "it appears that prison culture and community culture are linked in ways that are important to understand" if we hope to address the revolving door issue of our prison systems. According to the authors, there will be a need for further examination of the reciprocal relationship between prison and community cultures before we can consider the policy implications of the "culture in action" paradigm.

In chapter three Byrne and Hummer examine the impact of institutional culture on prison violence and disorder and provide an overview of potential solutions. Appendix A of this chapter is an especially useful compilation of recent research on prison culture and institutional violence and disorder.

Chapters four, five, six, and nine present studies from the United Kingdom and cover the following topics: legitimacy and imprisonment, why prison staff culture matters, culture, performance, and disorder, and the cultural roots in England's prisons.

The National Institute of Corrections' institutional culture change initiative, a multisite evaluation, is reported on by the editors in chapter seven. Unfortunately the external evaluation of this initiative was discontinued and all we have are preliminary results.

Chapter eight explores prison culture and the treatment and control of mentally ill offenders and is a particularly timely issue given the current interest in mental illness in our prison systems. Lurigio and Snowden conclude their review by noting that “the current culture of the prison does little to alleviate prisoners’ mental health problems and may actually aggravate them.”

The final chapter by Byrne, Hummer, and Stowell reviews prison violence, prison culture, and offender change and point to new directions for researchers, policy makers, and practitioners. The agenda for research would include a focus on prison violence, examination of prison performance, and the movement toward an evidence-based corrections system. The authors suggest there is a need to pay attention to the emerging perspective on the social ecology of violence if we are to gain a better understanding of the person-environment interaction. In addition, developing the role of culture in explaining violence in both institutional and community settings and further inquiry into the “culture in action”

paradigm would be useful theoretical explorations. Finally, the authors conclude that new directions in policy and practice will involve inmate, staff, and management-focused change strategies.

This is a very informative and insightful book and should be a good starting point for future researchers and theoreticians to continue the pathways commenced by the writers included in this volume. There is indeed a necessity for all us — practitioners, policymakers, politicians, and commentators on corrections — to better understand the role of institutional and community cultures on violence. Violent places, whether in an institutional or community setting, can and sometimes does contribute to violent people! This book is a worthwhile read, and the excellent bibliographies included with each chapter make further reading and research possible.

Donald G. Evans

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

NEW CHIEF IN KERN COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

After a nationwide search, the Superior Court of California has announced the appointment of **David Kuge** as Chief Probation Officer for Kern County effective December 18, 2009.

Kuge started his probation career in 1977 as a group counselor in Juvenile Hall. He has worked jointly with the Kern County Sheriff’s Office gang units, developed grant programs, community education and/or outreach, and has been instrumental in the development and implementation of many of the successful crime prevention efforts of the Kern County Probation Department. He has served in various supervisory capacities in both juvenile and adult probation and will leave his current position of Deputy Chief Probation Officer.

“Kern County was fortunate to have a number of excellent candidates from all over the nation,” said **Jon Stuebbe**, Supervising Juvenile Court Judge. “We are very pleased to find the best candidate was already serving our citizens in the Department he will now lead.”

Kuge graduated from California State University – Fresno with a bachelor’s degree in criminology.

The search for a new Chief Probation Officer started this past August when **John Roberts** announced his pending retirement.

VECCHIO NEW HEAD IN LUZERNE COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

Michael Vecchio of Edwardsville, who has served as the acting Luzerne County probation director since the dismissal of his predecessor in February 2009, will continue in the position on a permanent basis, President Judge **Chester B. Muroski** announced in September.

“He was chosen based on his 27 years of experience and he has done an admirable job in administering the probation office since he was tasked at the beginning of February when we let go a number of people,” Muroski said. “He has operated under extraordinary circumstances.”

Vecchio was originally hired by the probation department as a collections officer in May 1982. He worked as a probation officer for 13 years, a supervisor for three years, and as the deputy chief of adult probation for the six years before he replaced the former director, **Larry Saba**.

Vecchio said he felt “honored” by the appointment.

As probation director, Vecchio will oversee the department’s adult, juvenile and collections divisions, and will earn an annual salary of \$78,159, Muroski said in a court order confirming the appointment.

NEW DIRECTOR IN BEXAR COUNTY, TEXAS

The judges of Bexar County, Texas, selected **Jarvis Anderson** as the new Director of the Bexar County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in San Antonio, Texas, effective January 2010. Anderson, a felony case manager who has been with the department since 1993, replaced the embattled **Bill Fitzgerald**, who submitted a letter of resignation following a vote of no confidence by the county court-at-law judges.

The Bexar County department is an organizational member of the National Association of Probation Executives.

NEW PROBATION CHIEF IN FRANKLIN COUNTY, VIRGINIA

Cynthia Hughes has been named Chief Probation and Parole Officer for Franklin County – Probation and Parole District 37 – by the Virginia Department of Corrections.

A Franklin native, Hughes was appointed to her new post by **Sherman Lea**, director of the Western Region for Community Corrections for the Department of Corrections.

Hughes, a graduate of James Madison University with a degree in sociology, has worked for the Department of Corrections for ten years. She is a former deputy with the Franklin County Sheriff’s Department, serving as a court bailiff for Circuit Judge **William N. Alexander, II**, and former Circuit Judge **B. A. Davis**.

Executive Exchange

During her career with the corrections agency, Hughes has been a surveillance officer, probation officer, senior probation officer, and deputy chief probation and parole officer.

As chief of the district that includes Franklin County and Rocky Mount, Hughes supervises a 10-member staff that includes probation officers, surveillance officers, and other staff members. The district staff provides services for 429 adults in Franklin County and Rocky Mount who are currently on probation or parole.

NEW CHIEF IN ORANGE COUNTY, NEW YORK

In January 2010 Orange County Executive **Edward A. Diana** announced the appointment of **Derek Miller** as Director of the Orange County Probation Department; he succeeds **Victoria Casey**, who retired last year.

"I want to thank Mr. Miller for his willingness to assume the role of Director for this very important department," Diana said. "I know that he will continue the level of professionalism and service of his predecessor, Mrs. Casey. I would also like to acknowledge the hard work of **Vince Morgiewicz** who was acting director following Mrs. Casey's retirement."

Miller commented, "I look forward to working with County Executive Edward Diana and the Legislature in their efforts to serve and protect the residents of Orange County."

Miller has worked for Orange County for the past 22 years. He began his career with Orange County working for the Department of Social Services and transferred to Probation in 1990. He has been a Supervisor since 2005 overseeing officers in the Goshen, Middletown, and Port Jervis Offices. He has also supervised crime victims counselors, worked with family offense petitions, and domestic violence victims.

NEW TEHAMA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, PROBATION CHIEF NAMED

In late September 2009 the Board of Supervisors voted to appoint **Richard Muench** as the new Chief Probation Officer for Tehama County; he took over for interim chief **Renny Noll** in October.

Muench brings more than 30 years of experience in San Diego County as Deputy Chief Probation Officer and his appointment was met with approval from Noll. Although officers making the transition from a larger county to a smaller one may have different parameters to work with, Noll said he had seen evidence no such issue will be present with Muench.

Noll has occupied the chief's position since June 30, when probation veteran **Daniel Emry** retired. Noll himself had retired, but his decades of work in probation were such that he still attracted the notice of the county and was brought in for the interim period.

NEW YORK'S CENTER FOR COURT INNOVATION AWARDED TOP PRIZE BY DRUCKER INSTITUTE

The Drucker Institute at Claremont Graduate University has announced the winners of the 2009 Peter F. Drucker Award for Nonprofit Innovation.

The Center for Court Innovation, a New York-based nonprofit think tank that helps courts and criminal justice agencies aid victims, reduce crime and improve public trust in the justice system, is the recipient of the \$100,000 first-place prize — an award made possible in large part through the generosity of the Coca-Cola Foundation.

Founded as a public-private partnership between the New York State Unified Court System and the Fund for the City of New York, the Center serves as the court's independent research and development arm, creating demonstration projects that test new ideas. The Center's projects include community courts, drug courts, reentry courts, domestic violence courts and mental-health courts.

The Drucker Institute honored the Center for Court Innovation at a gala dinner in Los Angeles on December 10, 2009. The keynote speaker at the event was **David Paine**, an expert on how social media is transforming the face of volunteering in America and the president and co-founder of MyGoodDeed, the nonprofit that helped establish September 11 as a National Day of Service and Remembrance. This year's award dinner is part of the Drucker Centennial, a global celebration marking the 100th birthday of **Peter Drucker**.

At the heart of the Center for Court Innovation's work is a philosophy that, rather than simply processing cases like widgets in a factory, the justice system should focus on achieving better outcomes for victims, defendants and communities. By pioneering the concept of "problem-solving justice," the Center has helped shift how judicial performance is measured. Rather than simply counting how many cases can be processed in a set period of time, the Center asks courts to define their measurement of success differently, by asking questions such as: What impact does case processing have on crime? Do defendants comply with court orders? Is it possible to improve perceptions of fairness?

"What the Center is doing is a great example of the way Peter Drucker defined innovation: change that creates a new dimension of performance," said **Rick Wartzman**, executive director of the Drucker Institute. "Through its work, the Center has literally changed the way that the major players in the system — judges, attorneys, criminal justice officials — think about their jobs and the impact they're having. Through its community-court model, the Center has been able to take low-level offenders and give them a chance to repair the harm they've done and be reintegrated into the fabric of their neighborhoods. Victims, meanwhile, are given a greater voice in the process and have enjoyed enhanced safety.

"It is also fitting that the Center is a public-private partnership," Wartzman added. "Drucker believed strongly that for society to be healthy, each sector has a vital role to play."

The judges for the Drucker Award were particularly impressed with the results that the Center has achieved. For instance, in southwest Brooklyn, major crime has declined by 50% since the opening of the organization's Red Hook Community Justice Center. At the same time, some 78% of local residents now approve of the courts, up from just 12% before Red Hook was launched.

Greg Berman, director of the Center, noted that he and his colleagues are thrilled to win the Drucker Award. "There is no higher honor in our book," Berman said. "We're enormously proud to be associated with the past winners of this prize and with the spirit of Peter Drucker. Like Drucker, we believe in the transformative potential of the social sector. We have worked enormously hard over the past 15 years to reform the justice system, both here in New York and around the world. The Drucker Award will give us a booster shot of momentum as we continue to advance our vision of a more effective and humane justice system."

The Drucker Award for Nonprofit Innovation has been given annually since 1991 to recognize existing programs that have made a real difference in the lives of the people they serve. Cash prizes are designed to celebrate, inspire and further the work of innovative social-sector organizations based in the United

States. Thanks to funding from the Coca-Cola Foundation, the first-place award will be increased to \$100,000 through at least 2015, up from the \$35,000 prize of previous years.

The Drucker Institute at Claremont Graduate University is a think tank and action tank whose purpose is to stimulate effective management and ethical leadership across all sectors of society. It does this, in large part, by advancing the ideas and ideals of Peter F. Drucker, the father of modern management. The Institute acts as a hub for a worldwide network of Drucker Societies: volunteer-driven organizations that are using Drucker's teachings to bring about positive change in their local communities.

PATRICK NAMED CHIEF IN HIDALGO COUNTY, TEXAS

Arnold Patrick, who has worked under two NAPE members, was recently appointed Director of the Hidalgo County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Edinburg, Texas. He replaced **Joe Lopez**, who held that position for a number of years prior to retirement.

Patrick, who has a bachelor's degree in criminal justice from Southwest Texas State University, has recorded over two decades in the delivery of human services.

During his career, he worked for NAPE members **John Wilmoth**, Director of the Concho Valley Community Supervision and Corrections Department in San Angelo, and **Tom Plumlee**, recently retired Director of the Tarrant County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Fort Worth.

YOLO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA, APPOINTS NEW CHIEF

In November 2009 the Yolo County Board of Supervisors appointed **Marjorie Rist**, a five-year employee of the probation department, as Chief Probation Officer. Rist has served as interim chief probation officer since former Chief **Don Meyer** left in August to become the Sacramento County Chief Probation Officer. Since then, she has been credited with helping Yolo County win a \$2.7 million federal grant for nine probation officers to oversee low-risk offenders released into the community while awaiting trial.

"Our decision to appoint her Chief Probation Officer was unanimous and enthusiastic," board Chairman **Mike McGowan** said in a news statement. "She has demonstrated her abilities to lead as interim chief and rose to the top in our search to hire a new Chief Probation Officer."

Rist joined Yolo County in 2004 as Assistant Superintendent of the Juvenile Hall. She was promoted to juvenile division manager in 2006 and Assistant Chief Probation Officer in March. Rist, who previously worked for the Butte County Probation Department, earned a bachelor's degree in management at St. Mary's College of California.

NEW MEMBERS OF PENNSYLVANIA BOARD OF PROBATION AND PAROLE CONFIRMED

On December 16, 2009, Governor **Edward G. Rendell** announced the confirmation by the Senate of **Michael L. Green**, **Jeffrey R. Imboden**, and **John R. Tuttle** to the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole.

"These three individuals are highly qualified and experienced in the areas of public safety, victim's issues and offender manage-

ment," said Governor Rendell. "I know they will serve the citizens of Pennsylvania well in the administration of their duties."

Green, first appointed to the board in 2003, received a bachelor's degree in sociology in 1968 from Morgan State University, Baltimore, Maryland, and a master's degree in social administration from Temple University in 1973. He has over 30 years of experience in community corrections as a line staff probation officer, Chief Probation Officer, and as a drug court coordinator prior to his appointment to the board. As a current board member, he serves on the Berks County Reentry Court program.

Imboden, also first appointed to the Board in 2003, earned a bachelor's degree from Grove City College in political science in 1972 and a master's degree in arts and teaching from Antioch School of Education, Keene, New Hampshire, in 1975. From 1997 to 2003 he worked for the Lebanon County Adult Probation Department as the Chief Probation Officer. From 1985 to 1997 he was a state parole agent and was named State Parole Agent of the Year in 1994.

Tuttle earned a bachelor's degree in sociology from Thiel College in 1978 and a master's degree in criminal justice from Penn State University in 1991. He began his criminal justice career in 1978 with the York County Probation Department where he worked for 22 years. In 2000 he became the Central Regional Director for the board. Two years later he assumed the position of Deputy Executive Director with the responsibility for oversight of all field and institutional parole agents. Tuttle currently services as President of the National Association of Probation Executives.

Under the Parole Act of 1941, board members are responsible for making decisions regarding the release, violation and revocation of inmates and parolees. In addition, they assist the chairman of the board with policies and operation of the agency.

KIRKPATRICK NAMED CHIEF FOR FULTON COUNTY, NEW YORK

The Fulton County Board of Supervisors approved the appointment of **Michael Kirkpatrick** as the new Director of the Fulton County Probation Department, replacing longtime Director **Warren S. Greene**, who retired at the end of the year after more than three decades of distinguished service with the department.

Kirkpatrick, who served as a supervisor with the department, assumed his new position on January 1, 2010.

NEW CHIEF IN CALAVERAS COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

Recently the Calaveras County Board of Supervisors in San Andreas, California, voted unanimously to confirm **Teri Hall** as the county's Chief Probation Officer. Chief Probation Officers are appointed by the county's judges and must be approved by county supervisors. Hall will receive a salary of \$103,000.

Hall replaces former Chief Probation Officer **Mike Kriletich**, who retired in December.

Hall's career in criminal justice spans a quarter of a century. After earning a degree in criminal justice at California State University-Sacramento, she was hired as a police officer by the Sacramento Police Department in 1985. Hall injured her knee during training and had to resign. Hall returned to Amador County and worked in 1986 and 1987 as an Amador County deputy probation officer. She later moved to a job as a probation department transportation officer in Calaveras County and became a Calaveras County deputy probation officer in 1989.

Executive Exchange

In the following decades Hall served Calaveras County at various times as a narcotics officer and a probation supervisor. Most recently, she was Assistant Chief Probation Officer.

GEORGIA'S BELL-FORSYTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT HAS NEW CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER

Jeanie Sims has been selected Chief Probation Officer for the Bell-Forsyth Judicial Circuit; she replaces **Marcia McIntyre**, who is now a Chief Probation Officer in a nearby county.

A Brenau University graduate, Sims has held numerous positions with the department, most recently serving as an administrator for the Gainesville Day Reporting Center. She will receive a master's degree in public administration from Columbus University in May.

Sims was selected by Georgia Department of Corrections Commissioner **Brian Owens** due to her service to the department, which dates to 1986. Owens said in a statement that Sims "has been an asset to the department for many years. I am confident the staff and probationers in Forsyth County will benefit from her experience."

CHRISTIAN NAMED WEST VIRGINIA PROBATION OFFICER OF THE YEAR

Susan Christian, Chief Probation Officer for West Virginia's Nineteenth Judicial Circuit — comprised of Barbour and Taylor Counties — has been named the 2009 Probation Officer of the Year by the West Virginia Association of Probation Officers (WVAPO).

Christian, a graduate of Alderson-Broaddus College in 1973, has worked with thousands of juveniles in her capacity as probation officer. She has served on the Board of Directors of Probation Services for West Virginia and has served on numerous committees of WVAPO.

According to Taylor County Circuit Court Judge **Alan D. Moats**, "Susan is respected throughout the state and is a leader among her peers. She is hard working, dedicated, and has made a positive impact on the lives of countless youth in our circuit. She is very deserving of this high honor."

Christian resides in the Flemington area of Taylor County with her husband Mike. She is a member of the Bailey Town United Methodist Church in Rosemont.

SCHIRALDI TO LEAD NEW YORK CITY PROBATION

New York City Mayor **Michael R. Bloomberg** recently announced the appointment of **Vincent N. Schiraldi** as Commissioner of the Department of Probation. Schiraldi is a national leader in the field of rehabilitation, with more than 25 years of experience and a record of reform and success. He most recently led the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services in Washington, D.C., where he turned a troubled agency that was on the verge of being placed under court supervision into a national model. His reforms were recently recognized by Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government "Innovations in American Government" awards program for being among the "Top 50" most innovative programs in the country. He replaces Acting Commissioner **Patricia Brennan**, who has served ably in that capacity since the departure of Commissioner Martin Horn last summer.

Schiraldi's professional experience includes work as Director of the District of Columbia Department of Youth Rehabilitation Ser-

vices, founder and Executive Director of the Justice Policy Institute in Washington, D.C., Western Regional Director of the National Center on Institutions and Alternatives in San Francisco, California, Case Developer at the National Center on Institutions and Alternatives in New York City, Houseparent/Recreation Coordinator at the New York State Division for Youth, Foster Parent at the San Francisco Department of Social Service, and lecturer on juvenile justice reform at San Francisco State and Georgetown Universities.

The Department of Probation gives adult and juvenile offenders the tools they need to redirect their lives and holding them accountable if they fail to lead a law-abiding life. Probation works to strengthen families and reduce the number of juveniles removed from their homes. The department works with community groups and other criminal justice agencies, providing information and services to the courts and giving victims a voice in the justice system.

Schiraldi graduated with a Bachelor of Arts from Binghamton University and with a Masters in Social Work from New York University. He is a native New Yorker who grew up in Greenpoint, Brooklyn.

GRAYSON COUNTY, TEXAS, HAS NEW DIRECTOR

On December 16, 2009, State District Judge **Jim Fallon** welcomed new Grayson County Chief Probation Officer **Alan Brown** at a ceremony in Sherman, Texas. He replaces **Jason Kirk**, who has served in that position in an interim capacity.

County Court-at-Law Judge **James C. Henderson** introduced Brown as an experienced probation officer. He is leaving his post of 12 years as Chief Juvenile Probation Officer for Hunt County. Henderson said Brown is a 20-year veteran of the criminal justice system, also serving as a probation official in Kaufman County and Bryan County. Brown earned his bachelor's degree in criminal justice at Southeastern Oklahoma State University. He also holds a master's degree in criminal justice from Texas A&M University at Commerce.

NEW CHIEF IN VENTURA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

The Ventura County Board of Supervisors recently voted to make Deputy Chief Probation Officer **Mark Varela** the head of his agency following the retirement of Chief **Karen Staples** in March.

Varela will oversee three departments, encompassing adult and juvenile probation and supervised release, and other juvenile justice programs. The agency has 210 employees and an annual budget of about \$25 million. The agency director's maximum salary is about \$167,000 a year.

Varela was recommended for the job by County Executive Officer **Marty Robinson** and a panel of county judges.

Varela has worked for the probation agency since 1988, and as chief deputy for the past two years.

NAPE PAST PRESIDENT RECOGNIZED AT SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

On April 22, 2010, former NAPE President **Dan Richard Beto** was presented the *Defensor Pacem Medal* by the Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University (SHSU). This award — given annually to an individual or organization in recognition of outstanding contributions to advancing the mission of the Criminal Justice Center — was presented to Beto by **Jurg Ger-**

ber, Professor of Criminal Justice and Director of International Programs, and **Vincent Webb**, Dean of the College of Criminal Justice and Director of the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center.

In presenting the award, Gerber noted that Beto had devoted more than four decades to the criminal justice system, primarily in the area of community corrections, and that from 1994 to 2005 he served as the founding Executive Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas. Beto has also funded endowed scholarships at SHSU to provide financial assistance to students majoring in criminal justice, sociology, and education.

The *Defensor Pacem Medal*, first presented in the early 1980s, is the highest honor presented by the Criminal Justice Center.

ALEXANDER SWORN IN AS CHIEF FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA

Melissa Alexander, Ph.D., was appointed Chief U. S. Probation Officer for the Middle District of North Carolina, headquartered in Greensboro, on May 4, 2010. Alexander is the first female Chief for the Middle District.

Prior to joining the Middle District, Alexander worked for the U.S. Probation Office for the Eastern District of Missouri in St. Louis and the Administrative Office of the U. S. Courts in Washington, D.C., where she focused on implementing evidence-based practices in the Federal Probation and Pretrial Services System.

She got her start in probation with the Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Dallas, Texas, where she served as Chief Psychologist, and later she served as Director of the Collin County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in McKinney, Texas.

Alexander received her bachelor's degree from Loyola University in New Orleans and a doctorate in clinical psychology from the University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center in Dallas.

Alexander has been a longtime member of NAPE and previously served as the organization's Secretary.

BLEVINS TO HEAD LOS ANGELES COUNTY PROBATION

Donald H. Blevins, who has been credited with turning around Alameda County's Probation Department, became Los Angeles County's Chief Probation Officer in April 2010. He replaces **Robert Taylor**, who retired on February 5, 2010.

Cited for his experience, managerial skills and leadership, Blevins has spent his entire 34-year career in the probation field, more than 14 years of which has been in management.

"He turned around the Alameda County Probation Department, one of the most-troubled probation agencies in the state, and he is just what Los Angeles County needs at this critical juncture," said Supervisor **Zev Yaroslavsky**.

Blevins acknowledged that Alameda County had some difficult issues when he joined that department as chief probation officer in 2003. Among his accomplishments in Alameda County were the introduction of evidence-based practices to move toward assessment-driven services to clients; collaboration to create a juvenile mental health court; expansion of service to sexually exploited minors; enhanced literacy program for juvenile hall youth; implementation of a kiosk reporting system for adult offenders; institution of cost-effective alternatives to detention, including electronic and GPS monitoring; and enhancement of revenue and fee collection.

Noting that the Los Angeles County Probation Department was the largest probation department in the world, Blevins said he considers his new job "an opportunity of a lifetime" and looks forward to helping the department "get back on track." "I like a challenge, and this is a challenge on a grand scale," he said.

He is active in numerous professional organizations, including the National Institute of Corrections, the Chief Probation Officers of California, the California Parole, Probation and Corrections Association, the American Probation and Parole Association, and the National Association of Probation Executives.

He received a Bachelor of Arts degree in psychology and sociology from the United States International University/Cal Western Campus-San Diego in 1974 and did graduate work in sociology in 1976 at the San Diego State University.

The Los Angeles County Probation Department, established in 1903, has a \$692.8 million budget and 6,136 positions. Its headquarters are in Downey.

MISSISSIPPI MAN FACES ASSAULT CHARGES AFTER ESCAPE

A Jackson, Mississippi, man has been charged with assault on a law enforcement officer, resisting, and evading arrest after escaping from a sheriff's deputy and a community corrections officer on March 22, 2010, according to a news release from the Madison County Sheriff's Office.

Authorities were transporting **Chevalia D. Collier**, age 21, to the J. Alexander Leech Criminal Justice Complex on a violation of a Community Corrections warrant when he escaped shortly after 10 a.m., according to the release.

The release said Collier assaulted Deputy **Karen Gilman** and ran away. After a brief chase by Gilman and **Bob Anderson**, Community Corrections Director and a member of the NAPE International Committee, Collier was apprehended near the Pizza Hut on Chester Street.

The release said Anderson sustained minor injuries and was treated and released at the Family Care Walk-In Clinic on University Parkway.

Subsequent contact with Bob reveals he is bruised but doing fine.

DEL CARMEN HONORED BY ACJS

Rolando del Carmen, a longtime friend of the National Association of Probation Executives, has been recognized by the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (ACJS) for his work with students. For more than 35 years, criminal justice faculty member del Carmen has been respected by his students for his commitment to mentor them during their time at Sam Houston State University (SHSU), continuing with his support even after they graduated.

ACJS formally recognized that dedication when it recently presented del Carmen a 2010 Outstanding Mentor Award during the organization's annual conference in San Diego.

A Regents' Professor within the Texas State University System and Distinguished Professor of Criminal Justice at SHSU, del Carmen is considered one of the nation's leading experts on criminal justice law and has been honored in numerous justice arenas as being among the top in his field with productivity and quality of work.

This is not the first time ACJS has honored del Carmen. He is the only individual in the academy's history to have received the

Executive Exchange

organization's top three honors — the Fellow Award (1990), the Bruce Smith Sr. Award (1997), and the Founder's Award (2005).

One of his former students who is now a colleague spoke about how del Carmen had provided direction for her in several capacities.

"He has been an outstanding mentor for me as a student, faculty member and administrator in the College of Criminal Justice at SHSU over the past 20 years," said **Janet L. Mullings**, professor, associate dean and chair of faculty. "His dedication to our undergraduate and graduate students and their scholarship is unparalleled," she said. "Literally thousands of SHSU alumni have benefited from Dr. del Carmen's unfailing support and direction."

"To be known as a 'del Carmen student' is a badge of honor both within the College of Criminal Justice and in the field of criminal justice," wrote **Craig Hemmens**, who is now a professor in the department of criminal justice and the director of the honors college at Boise State University in Idaho. "Professor del Carmen's mentorship skills are extraordinary because of all that they encompass," he said. "He shows students how to write for publication, which is of course essential to success as an academic, but this is the least of his mentoring."

"What sets him apart from the many fine scholars I have known is his concern for the individual student," Hemmens explained. "He shows students how to conduct themselves in academe, both by his words and by his actions. His high degree of integrity is surpassed only by his compassion and concern for his students."

Another former student, **Katherine Bennett**, now a professor in the department of criminal justice, social and political science at Armstrong Atlantic State University in Savannah, Georgia, wrote: "Many of Dr. del Carmen's former students are making significant contributions in their own right. Many have extensive records of scholarly publications, are department heads or associate deans in various universities, and hold leadership positions in professional organizations. Dr. del Carmen is a person of humility and kindness and would not acknowledge this, but I firmly believe that their successes are due in large part to his tutelage."

"He is a true scholar who has pioneered an entire area of research in criminal justice," wrote **Michael S. Vaughn**, professor of criminal justice, assistant dean for graduate studies and director of the criminal justice doctoral program at Sam Houston State University. "On the basis of his many accomplishments, it is difficult to adequately describe his total contribution to the criminal justice community — his unwavering devotion to teaching, his eternal positive attitude, his unrelenting work-ethic, his ability to find consensus among colleagues, his efforts to make arcane legal doctrine accessible to practitioners, and the way he has shaped the careers of countless students who have gone on to become leaders in the discipline."

Del Carmen explained why he felt mentoring was so important. "I try to help students in every possible way with the emphasis on academics," he said. "I want them to be 'the best they can be' both in and outside the classroom. Here at the Criminal Justice Center, the emphasis is on scholarly publications, so I try to help the students as much as I can write articles that are publishable in national journals."

"My experience over the years tells me that students welcome and highly deserve this one-on-one mentoring, particularly on matters that benefit them directly in their professional lives," he said. "Publication is necessary for those who want to be involved in teaching and research, and practically all of our graduate students here at Sam Houston State want to be professors and researchers."

Del Carmen also acknowledged the contributions made by his

colleagues at SHSU. "Our students have been very grateful over the years for the efforts of our criminal justice faculty," he said. "The award given to me at ACJS is only symbolic of what the faculty in the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University has done over the years," he said. "I just happened to be the one who got it this year. However, many of the other faculty members in the program are just as deserving, if not more deserving of this award."

"I sincerely thank previous and present students who nominated me for this award," he said. "I also thank the faculty and administrators, from the college up through the university level, for their encouragement and support during my stay here at Sam Houston State University."

Over the years del Carmen has made presentations at NAPE functions and has served on the faculty of the successful Executive Development Program.

JACKSON NEW CHIEF IN HALE COUNTY, TEXAS

In January 2010 **Andrew Jackson** was appointed Director of the Hale County Community Supervision and Corrections Department by District Judges **Ed Self** and **Rob Kinkaid** appointed Jackson to replace **Bill Coleman**, who retired after almost 32 years of distinguished service in adult probation.

Jackson, a 1991 graduate of Wayland Baptist University with a bachelor's degree in sociology, said: "It's always been my goal to help people, help in society, to understand different cultures. My biggest thing is seeing people change and become better citizens."

Following an internship with the Hale County Community Supervision and Correctional Department, Jackson worked for the Texas Department of Criminal Justice Institutional Division at Swisher County Detention Center from 1992 until December 1997 and then at Formby Unit. He went to work for the Hale County Community Supervision and Correctional Department in February 1998.

As adult probation director, Jackson supervises seven probation officers, a case worker and five support staff members. He also manages the budget and reports to the 242nd and 64th District judges. The Hale County Probation Department has jurisdiction over Swisher and Castro counties and supervises more than 700 offenders. The department also serves indirect clients, for a total of 1,400 clients across the three counties.

Coleman, the former director, was recently successful in winning the race for Hale County Judge.

PENNSYLVANIA COUNTY ADULT PROBATION OFFICE GETS NEW DIRECTOR

According to an article appearing in the *Pittsburgh Post-Gazette*, the 5th Judicial District of Pennsylvania has appointed a new director of Allegheny County Adult Probation Department.

Thomas McCaffrey will take the position once held by **James J. Rieland**, who retired last year, the county announced.

McCaffrey has been with the court since 1980, starting as a probation officer. He later served as a unit supervisor, senior manager of adult probation, and has overseen the courts pretrial services department. In this position, he expanded the courts pretrial services electronic monitoring program and created the first risk-assessment tools for bail recommendations.

McCaffrey has a bachelor's degree from the University of Pittsburgh and is active in many state and local associations.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES

Who We Are

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

What We Do

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

Why Join

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

Types of Membership

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

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

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

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

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

Membership Application

NAME _____ TITLE _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE # _____ FAX # _____ E-MAIL _____

DATE OF APPLICATION _____

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

Please make check payable to **THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES** and mail to:

NAPE Secretariat
 ATTN: Christie Davidson
 Correctional Management Institute of Texas
 George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center
 Sam Houston State University
 Huntsville, Texas 77341-2296
 (936) 294-3757

