

# National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

SPRING 2011

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE: REMEMBERING, RE-THINKING, AND RE-ENGINEERING PROBATION

Remembering, re-thinking, and re-engineering probation. Remember the old saying, "What goes around comes around?" In some ways the new emergence of evidence-based principles and practices is really not new at all. Yes, there is finally proof as to what principles and practices — when actively and appropriately implemented — actually help probationers change their behavior. Of course, there are new names for these principles and practices and new tools to aid in when and what practice or principle should be implemented. But for those of us dedicated to probation service over decades, the new world of probation really isn't all that new but more of a confirmation of what we knew worked all along.

Please don't misunderstand. I am the consummate evidence-based principles and practices cheerleader having instituted every facet of the EBP Integrated Model into probation practice in Nebraska. Contained in this publication is the first of a series of articles written about the changes, challenges, and accomplishments of Nebraska's Probation System adapting to and incorporating the EBP way into the daily business of probation.

What I am doing is remembering. Remembering what probation officers knew and didn't know through the years. In 1975 when I began my career as a juvenile officer, most everyone knew which kids were likely to keep getting into trouble and which kids weren't. To be more accurate, we hunched but didn't know for sure. We suspected that parents who used legal substances in excess and illegal substances had more problems with their children. We also saw that kids who were abused by their parents still loved them. We also saw that some adults given the opportunity



for probation seemed to make it through as if we weren't even there. Conversely, some adults placed on probation that we thought "hopeless" actually successfully completed their term never to re-offend again. What probation officers did know in those days was that developing a relationship with a probationer usually helped the probationer do better. But that was before excessive caseloads and inadequate resourcing of probation systems.

By 1985, most probation officers recognized that substance abuse treatment on a probation order worked even when probationers didn't want to participate. Connecting a probationer to an appropriate treatment option generally improved the outcome of the probationer. But of course in the 1980s third-party insurance carriers covered substance abuse evaluations and treatment, so treatment opportunities were available. However, those "anti-social" probationers weren't those lining up at the door for treatment. It took officers working

harder to develop relationships with people who weren't likeable to help them get help.

During the 1990s probation systems had years of experience with risk classification instruments as a means to prioritize workloads given the fact that probation resources had not kept up with probation caseloads. The number of "contacts" a probationer received from a probation officer began to prioritize probationers. The treatment connection to probationer success was there, but, unfortunately, successful "easy to access" hospital-based substance abuse treatment and even mental health treatment was hard to come by. Third-party payers were not so inclined to pay for any kind of treatment and fewer probationers had insurance coverage. The treatment world was changing with the recognition of a

## CONTENTS

President's Message, <i>Ellen F. Brokofsky</i> .....	1
Revisiting "Broken Windows" Probation: The Next Step in Fighting Crime, <i>Reinventing Probation Council</i> .....	3
Building Bridges: ICPA's 12th Annual Conference, <i>Donald G. Evans</i> .....	9
CEP Statement of Probation Values and Principles Established .....	13
New Probation National Standards for the Management of Offenders in England and Wales .....	15
The Business of Probation: Management Integrating Business Practices with Evidence-Based Practices and Principles to Achieve Excellent Outcomes, <i>Ellen Fabian Brokofsky</i> .....	17
Pragmatic Supervisory Response to Newly Assigned Adult Probation Officers, <i>Andrea Jackson and Robert L. Bingham</i> .....	20
From the Bookshelf .....	22
News from the Field .....	24

### PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE *cont'd*

co-occurring disorder as a meaningful diagnosis. New research emerged that recognized coerced treatment as a means of crime control. However, administrators and officers faced with budget constraints and no solid template for success were attempting to engage and convince probation staff, as well as probationers, to do more with less.

While keeping abreast of the changes in the treatment world, probation officers were being told nothing they were doing really worked. The effectiveness of rehabilitation as a key factor in probation supervision had been questioned as early as the 1970s. So was there any surprise when Scared Straight programming emerged as a promising option to the idea that nothing works? Also, the hope of technology and tools like drug testing and electronic monitoring instilled optimism for cheaper supervision aids for more successful "monitoring," but often these tools weren't integrated in a meaningful case plan addressing the personal strengths and needs of the probationer.

As the number of probationer "contacts" grew to defining the role of a probation officer, probation systems more and more seemed to relinquish the notion that the personal engagement of a probation officer combined with treatment intervention was an effective, affordable, means of supervision that actually worked.

In looking back I suspect the absence of substantive research to support what the old-timers of the 70s, 80s, and 90s believed worked, enabled the perpetuation of practices that actually didn't work. The introduction of evidence-based principles and practices actually began in the 90s. However, they didn't really take off until the beginning of the new century when the National Institute of Corrections embraced the "new research" and the "new

approaches" to probation service delivery and offered select and various jurisdictions opportunities to learn anew.

Probation administrators all over the country are embracing evidence-based services, programs, and strategies because good leaders now know that good data drives effective practice in the supervision of both probationers and probation officers. We can prove treatment works. However, we are forced to be much more creative as to how to access it. We know or know how to find out what programs and services have the best chance of promoting probationer behavior change. We understand the value of assessing risk factors appropriately and correlating the correct level of engagement of the officer with the probationer. We recognize the limitless value of applying incentives and kudos. How fortunate we all are to have a road map now. But thanks to all those leaders, managers, officers, and support staff who tried to stay the course amidst criticism knowing what worked all along but just not able to prove it!

I hope you enjoy this edition of *Executive Exchange*. I encourage each of you to consider submitting articles for publication that showcase promising programs in your jurisdictions or assist others by simply putting your knowledge and experience serving the public and the probation profession on paper.

Thanks for all you do to provide quality leadership in a profession we know has such value. I look forward to seeing you at the NAPE events in Chicago in July.

**Ellen Fabian Brokofsky**  
President

### 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](mailto: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.

## REVISITING “BROKEN WINDOWS” PROBATION: THE NEXT STEP IN FIGHTING CRIME

by the

Reinventing Probation Council

In August 1999, following more than a year of deliberation, the Reinventing Probation Council of the Manhattan Institute, chaired by NAPE past President Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., issued *“Broken Windows” Probation: The Next Step in Fighting Crime*, the first of two reports dealing with reinventing probation. While some of the numbers have changed — as have programs, strategies, and leaders — many of the problems identified in this initial publication continue to exist more than a decade later. With this in mind, several members of the Reinventing Probation Council felt that republishing this monograph could serve a useful purpose. The work of reinvention is not a one-time event but a permanent commitment.

### Preface — 3 Million in our Midst

Violent crime rates have fallen nationally by 26 percent since 1993. Some of this drop is undoubtedly due to so-called “broken windows law enforcement” and community policing. In Boston and other places, probation departments have also helped cut crime, both on their own and in partnerships with police, community groups and clergy.

If the criminal justice system is going to keep violent crime on the run, however, it will need to do even more, beginning with a much better job of supervising the three million probationers in our midst.

This report is the work of a baker’s dozen of veteran practitioners, including several present or former leaders of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE) and American Probation and Parole Association (APPA), who met and deliberated independently over the past two years in Boston, New York, and Philadelphia.

In sum, we believe probation is at once the most troubled and the most promising part of America’s criminal justice system. We also believe that probation’s past troubles can be but a prologue to its coming triumphs. Herein, and in a longer, more detailed report prepared for and released through NAPE and APPA, we call for a new era of “broken windows” probation and community corrections.

We admit, perhaps more candidly than leading members of our profession have ever admitted, that widespread political and public dissatisfaction with community corrections has often been totally justified. We also outline new strategies and rationales for reinvesting in and reinventing probation.

Our report is sure to attract criticism from those who say our proposals are too soft on criminals, as well as from those who say they are too tough. To those outside of our profession who respond that our ideas are too little, too late, and to those who cynically advocate abolishing probation, we say, “Get real!” Taxpayers will

not finance what their ideas would imply, tripling the size of our prison system to accommodate the three million current probationers. To those within our profession who respond that our ideas concede too much to the field’s many critics and to popular misunderstandings of probation, we say, “Wake up!” As our report shows, hundreds of thousands of violent crimes are committed each year by people on probation. The public wants to reduce violent crime NOW: probation can either be part of the solution or part of the problem.

Either probation will be at the political and intellectual core of future policy oriented efforts to promote public safety and offender rehabilitation in America, or it will continue to be widely marginalized, mischaracterized and underfunded. The days of failed low- or no-supervision “fortress probation” can and should give way to a new era of politically and administratively successful “community probation.” We hope this report not only sparks both professional and public debate, but also sharply enhances civic awareness that “probation matters” and helps launch spirited efforts to “make probation work” in cities all across the country.

### Why Probation Matters

Probation enjoys a unique status within the criminal justice system. Each year ushers in a “new high” in the number of offenders either incarcerated or in the community under supervision, and each year probation serves as the disposition most often imposed by the courts. At the end of 1997, a record breaking total of 5.7 million offenders were under some form of correctional supervision — in prison, in jail, on probation or on parole. Of these, 3,261,888 were adults serving a probation sentence, or *just under 60% of the entire offender population!*

This means on any given day there are over 3 million probationers living in communities across the land. **More than half of them have been convicted of felony violations of the law.** Though they are expected to abide by the rules of probation or other special conditions of supervision, their range of freedom is comparable to that enjoyed by the citizenry at large. This means they may move about within their neighborhoods, go to the movies, shop, go to work, visit parks and pursue other activities that form the fabric of daily living. How these offenders are supervised and the effectiveness of the strategies that are adopted to control them carry enormous implications for public safety and the quality of community life.

### *Probation: A Matter of Life or Death*

Critics of community corrections have long charged that probation has failed to promote public safety, enforce court orders and get community-based criminals the drug treatment or other help they need to succeed in life and remain crime-free. The data show that all too often the critics stand on solid ground.

- Promoting Safety: About two-thirds of probationers commit another crime within three years of their sentence, and many

of these crimes are serious. The roughly 162,000 probationers returned to state prisons and incarcerated in 1991 were responsible for at least 6,400 murders, 7,400 rapes, 10,400 assaults and 17,000 robberies. Likewise, records show that 156 of the 1,411 persons convicted of murder in Virginia from 1990 to 1993 were on probation at the time they killed. If probation had done a better job, fewer people would have been killed or otherwise harmed by probationers, and the overall crime rate would have been much lower.

- **Enforcing Orders:** To remain out of jail, over 90 percent of probationers are ordered by the courts to get substance abuse counseling, remain under house arrest, perform community service or meet other such specific conditions. Unfortunately, studies have found that about half of all probationers do not comply with the terms of their sentence, and only a fifth of those who violate their sentences ever go to jail for their non-compliance. Such “intermediate sanctions” are almost never rigorously and consistently enforced.

Worse yet, in addition to those who won’t comply with orders are those who don’t even stay in contact with probation — the probation absconders. By the end of 1996, of the 3.2 million offenders on probation, some 288,000 were on absconder status, out of contact with probation, out of compliance with court orders and out from under any control or monitoring. In too many jurisdictions, next to nothing is being done to apprehend these scofflaws, a number of whom are “hiding in plain view.” The lesson is not lost on new probationers, who may find their obligations too onerous: Stop complying — they won’t come after you.

But can probation do anything about this horrific number of absconders? Or are defiant probationers free to roam the community without supervision and accountability?

The experience of Williamson County in Texas suggests an answer. In 1997, a decision was made by the local probation department to go after absconders seriously. By employing a variety of technology and databases to track missing probationers, that county arrested 470 probation violators in the first year of operation. In addition to bringing these offenders to justice, the absconder unit recovered nearly \$15,000 in outstanding fees.

By 1998, the unit was successful in arresting 605 probationers and collecting nearly \$51,000 in unpaid penalties, a significant jump in just one year. And this was accomplished by a two-person unit, staffed by one officer and a caseworker!

- **Helping Offenders:** Probation all too often fails to help probationers avoid drugs, learn to read, obtain jobs or otherwise get their lives together. For example, all the data show that almost half of today’s probationers were under the influence of alcohol or drugs when they committed their latest offense. The probation discipline has long argued that probationers need to obtain community based substance abuse treatment. Indeed, probation data from Massachusetts indicates that at least 80 percent of all probationers have such significant substance abuse problems that treatment is necessary. But only 37 percent of all probationers nationwide participate in any type of drug treatment program during their sentence, and only 32.5 percent nationally are tested for drug use once they do receive treatment.

### *Why Probation Isn’t Working*

Why has probation long been weak at promoting public safety, enforcing orders and helping offenders? A large part of the answer is that probation as a field has long been weakly funded, totally underresearched and woefully understaffed.

Compare probation spending to spending on prisons. Since 1985, the nation’s population of prisoners has more than doubled, and prison and jail budgets and staffing have more than grown apace. Spending on prisons now constitutes about a quarter of total state and local criminal justice spending (police, courts and corrections), and about two-thirds of total corrections spending.

But recall our earlier numbers: Community corrections, which includes parole, has about two-thirds of the persons in criminal custody. Despite this fact, it only receives one-third of the total corrections dollar, about half what prisons receive to serve only half the probation population! Even this figure overstates how much probation receives, since it splits this meager amount with parole agencies — even though there are fewer people on parole than behind bars, and even though the number of probationers who have been convicted of violent crimes rivals the number of parolees with a violent history.

The disparity between the prison and probation budgets is best seen by comparing per offender amounts spent on each. Most states spend between \$20,000 and \$50,000 a year for each person in their prison system. U.C. Davis criminologist Joan Petersilia notes, however, that we have spent barely “\$200 per year per probationer for supervision.” This has led to average probation caseloads between 100 to 500 offenders per probation officer. No wonder recidivism rates are so high!

Inadequate funding, however, is not the only cause for probation’s failure. All too often probation departments have employed practices that simply do not do the job. Consider some commonplace probation practices and their results:

- Drug testing that is scheduled in advance, providing test results two or more weeks after the test is administered and done infrequently, is ineffective as a deterrent to substance abuse;
- Conducting supervision mainly in office settings contributes little to the management of offender risk or public safety (an approach that has been likened to “fortress probation”);
- Spending an average of five to twenty minutes once a month with offenders in an office does not constitute a reasonable quantity or method of supervision.

Not all probation offices fit our examples. Many talented probation administrators and field staff struggle to find more effective methods of supervision. Some have succeeded, but unfortunately, most have not. The key issue is that the systems these individuals work within are often ill-prepared to listen and understand what local communities deem important.

Under these circumstances, it should be no surprise that active probationers compose nearly one-fifth of all felony arrests. And it should be no surprise that probation is widely disparaged and viewed by the public as an ineffective sanction — a “slap on the wrist.”

### **Probation Reform: Meeting the Public's Expectations**

Despite the recent drops in crime, the public believes crime rates are still too high, and they are upset with many aspects of the criminal justice system. They think violent felons are let out early, instead of serving their sentences. They think sentences for most crimes are a joke and that the system plea bargains every criminal just to process cases. They think the victim is ignored and the community is shut out, and they do not believe that probation or parole improve public safety.

What does the public want? First and foremost, they want *safety*. Public safety is the bottom line. They view controlling violent and dangerous offenders as the justice system's job. They are willing to pay for that. They are also willing to help. They want to be partners in the process, if only the system of justice will let them in. The public also requires the *truth*. They expect the system to do what it says it is doing. *They want the sentence to fit the crime, the offender and the circumstances.* They want to know that a sentence is a sentence, and that everyone will abide by it. They also want to know who is in their neighborhood. They want us to tell them if someone is dangerous, and to be told when the reverse is true.

Finally, they want *some good to come of it*. They do not want the process of justice to be a dead loss. They want to feel that justice creates value for the offender, for the victim and for the community. They want to believe that those working within the justice system know what they are doing, and that what people working in public safety do somehow adds value to their lives.

In view of its unique status, probation is invested with wide-ranging ability to meet the public's expectations. Its strength lies in its capacity and authority to repair broken lives and hold offenders accountable for the harm their actions have caused to victims and communities. Accordingly, probation is the criminal justice sanction best positioned strategically to contribute directly to public safety and community well-being.

Probation — when properly structured — is not a walk away or a “get-out-of-jail-free” card for an offender. Based on our lifetimes of experience in the probation system, we propose that probation offices nationwide embrace a new emerging paradigm that puts public safety and community involvement first.

### **How Probation Can Work**

Successful probation reforms underway in Boston, Spokane, Phoenix, in specific locales throughout Maryland and elsewhere are characterized by a heightened focus on achieving public safety goals through active partnerships with community and neighborhood groups. They are also characterized by the following key strategies:

*Placing Public Safety First*  
*Working in the Community*  
*Developing Partners in the Community*  
*Rationally Allocating Scarce Resources*  
*Enforcing Conditions and Penalizing Violations*  
*Emphasizing Performance Based Initiatives*  
*Encouraging Strong and Steady Leadership*

### **Public Safety Comes First**

Successful probation programs put public safety first. Their primary goal is to let the public move about and feel free of the risk of harm to their person or their property.

### **Supervise Probationers in the Neighborhood, Not the Office**

Public safety cannot come first where supervision, such as it is, takes place in the probation officer's office. Effective probation supervision must take place where offenders live and work. While the office is rightfully the base of probation supervision, the neighborhood should be the *place* of supervision. Firsthand knowledge of where the offender lives, his family and his immediate and extended environment are critical elements of meaningful supervision. Such community probation should be highly visible, and this visibility must be positive in nature.

Meaningful supervision also means that it is conducted at times not confined to the traditional 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday, workday. To be effective, it must be delivered at nights, on weekends, and on holidays.

*Two Arizona probation departments — the Maricopa County Adult Probation Department in Phoenix and the Pima County Adult Probation Department in Tucson — have experienced successful offender supervision efforts by increasing the level of offender contact in the community and by working non-traditional hours.*

### **Rationally Allocate Resources**

Successful probation programs rationally allocate their resources. Probation officers must spend more time supervising those offenders who are most at risk to violate their conditions of supervision and those whose offenses or affiliations pose a public safety risk (e.g., sex offenders, gang members, drug dealers, those with histories of violence). The rational allocation of resources is necessarily based on knowledge of the offender gleaned through presentence investigation reports, juvenile records, psychological evaluations and risk/needs assessments. Probation agencies must use assessments at the front end of the system to make placement decisions as well as continue using offender-specific assessments to routinely monitor their progress.

*Two systems that place considerable emphasis on assessments are the Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Dallas, Texas, and the Sixth Judicial District Department of Correctional Services in Cedar Rapids, Iowa.*

*In Dallas County, Texas, a new Comprehensive Assessment and Treatment Services (CATS) program was implemented in 1998 to address the gap in substance abuse and mental health treatment for probationers. The goal of CATS is to provide early assessment and treatment in order to increase successful completion of probation. Under this program all felony probationers must be screened. Those who cannot afford indicated services are provided those services by the County. CATS has already screened 4,400 probationers. Of those screened, 62 percent were referred to treatment for substance abuse and 9.5 percent were referred for mental health treatment.*

In addition, probation officers should be strategically assigned to supervise specific geographical areas rather than being randomly assigned to offenders as they are placed on probation. This concept, referred to as “place-based supervision,” affords an excellent opportunity for developing law enforcement and corrections partnerships. It also keeps probation officers close to their wards, allowing them to keep an eye on an offender even when they are not spending time with him.

*Several probation departments, like the one in Spokane, Washington, have developed meaningful partnerships with police and have strategically placed probation officers in areas where they are needed the most.*

## Executive Exchange

---

### *Enforce Violations of Conditions Quickly and Strongly*

Probationers often realize they may expect two or more “free ones” when it comes to dirty urine samples, electronic monitoring violations or failure to comply with a variety of supervision conditions. **For probation to be effective, this permissive practice must be abandoned.** All conditions of a probation sentence must be enforced, and all violations must be responded to in a timely fashion. A critical part of enforcing supervision conditions is the cooperation of the courts, where such violations are usually addressed. Those probation programs that emphasize strict enforcement of the rules and enjoy a supportive relationship with the courts tend to have fewer problems with offender compliance.

The key is that the response must be swift and sure. This does not mean that each violation will result in the revocation of probation, but rather the imposition of graduated sanctions (e.g., curfew or house arrest, electronic monitoring, mandatory drug treatment).

*An excellent example of a structured, graduated sanctions program is found in the Tarrant County Juvenile Probation Department in Fort Worth, Texas.*

Similarly, probation agencies need to be tough-minded and put teeth into apprehending absconders from probation. If it is easier for an offender to abscond than to comply with the terms and conditions of probation, then such behavior is simply reinforced. Probation agencies need to develop specialized units that work with law enforcement to apprehend offenders.

*A good example of a specialized absconder unit is that found in the McLennan County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Waco, Texas. Another is in Suffolk County, New York. Suffolk County Probation in New York has a warrant unit consisting of specially trained probation officers with full time responsibility for the location, apprehension, and arrest of probation violators who have absconded. In 1997, the unit, sometimes with assistance from other probation officers, made 209 arrests of absconders. That number rose to 331 in 1998. Large urban jurisdictions that are well managed can achieve even greater results. In 1998, Maricopa County Adult Probation served an astounding 2,400 warrants for felony probationers.*

### *Develop Partners in the Community*

The involvement of other agencies, organizations and interest groups is critical to the success of probation. Probation administrators should include community leaders and groups whenever there is a need to develop policies, initiate new programs, craft supervision strategies and deliver services. In essence, the community needs to play a vital and participatory role in community corrections. This may be achieved by:

- Creating a system that has meaningful participation from victims and the community;
- Developing partnerships with neighborhood groups, schools, businesses and the faith communities to bring offenders into an environment that has pro-social supports;
- Establishing cooperative partnerships between probation, law enforcement and other criminal justice agencies that focus on public safety;
- Partnering with human service, treatment and non-profit agencies to provide enhanced services to assess, diagnose, treat and supervise offenders;

- Creating a comprehensive education campaign to make citizens aware of the crime problem, the steps being taken to address it and communicating the message that their involvement is desired.

There are many potential partners with whom to collaborate. When probation agencies build these collaborative relationships, they are often able to effectively supervise offenders, impose greater leverage and accountability over them and return them safely to the community.

*Very good examples of such collaborative relationships have been established by Probation Departments in Boston, Massachusetts, and by the Suffolk County Probation Department in Yaphank, New York. In Boston, since the implementation of Operation Night Light and related community partnerships, homicide rates (the intended target) have dropped dramatically. In the years leading up to the change in strategies, the city averaged a hundred or so each year. Since 1995, when the program kicked in, the drop in homicides has been the steepest in the nation. In 1996, the city experienced 61 murders, down from 96 in the previous year (1990 was the high water mark with 153 homicides). In 1997, the toll fell to 43, in 1998 to 35. By August of 1999, the number stood at 17.*

Working with the community reduces recidivism and increases public safety. It also provides greater success in securing offender compliance with and completing probation. To build such partnerships, it is essential that probation agencies retool their operations to accomplish the following:

- The role of the probation officer must be redefined (e.g., attending neighborhood meetings, participating in local crime prevention activities), “place-based” supervision strategies must be adopted and non-traditional operating hours must be established;
- Criminal justice task forces must be created (inclusive of human services and/or the faith community) working together to develop enforcement strategies to reduce crime in the community. Such task forces should establish formal written agreements and protocols, co-locate in community offices, conduct joint staffing and share accountability for curtailing crime;
- Prevention strategies must be developed to work with community partners that engage the child and family in a holistic manner to ensure service delivery to the entire family;
- Community betterment activities should be pursued working with neighborhood groups, business organizations, religious leaders and city agencies;
- Collaborative supervision strategies must be developed to carefully monitor offenders in the community and to hold them rigorously accountable for the payment of all fines, restitution and other just debts. This necessarily includes a protocol for the public both to provide information and obtain feedback on crime issues and offenders in their neighborhoods, and to participate in shaping strategies to address these issues;
- A continuum of sanctions and treatment must be formed across the justice system that ensures rapid placement as a method to maintain public safety and to hold offenders accountable for all violating behaviors.

### *Establish Performance Based Initiatives*

Information-based decision making is paramount. The strategic and rational allocation of resources by probation agencies should be premised on developing, adjusting and retaining specific programs based on their performance.

Good evaluation models must be developed to measure program effectiveness. This includes not only the achievement of clearly defined program outcomes, but also effective program administration. A good program may prove unsuccessful if there was not a good action plan, poor implementation, or staff who were not properly trained or did not understand the program's philosophy.

### *Leadership is Critical*

In the final analysis, leadership is the most important ingredient for success. Leadership in probation does not come from unwieldy state bureaucracies, nor does it emanate from the work of agency committees. Clear and effective leadership comes from individuals — individuals who care deeply about probation, who are not satisfied with the status quo, who possess the courage to critique their profession and act with vision and dedication to do something about it. In sum, it flows from individuals who are risk takers, willing to enthusiastically embrace a new narrative for their field and the practice of probation.

### **Holding Probation Accountable**

Probation will change when those who run probation departments are held accountable for achieving — or failing to achieve — specific outcomes. The paramount outcome for probation is public safety. However, there are other valued outcomes that must be addressed if probation is to be successfully reengineered. These outcomes include equality of justice, punishment, crime prevention, and a restorative commitment to victims and communities. These outcomes express the public's expectation that the justice system is doing its job. These are the outcomes that matter and that require ongoing and careful measurement by probation practitioners.

In measuring such outcomes, corrections in general and probation in particular must apply business principles to everyday and long-term operations, except for the pursuit of profit or financial gain. As in business, the focus on clearly articulated results will drive a myriad of everyday supervision practices designed to be relevant to the accomplishment of such results. Three key business practices that must be given due attention, include the following:

- Research and development — identifying state-of-the-art strategies for achieving effectiveness with maximum efficiency, and the ongoing pursuit of evidence-based best practices;
- Staffing — ensuring that the values, vision, and competencies of staff for implementing appropriate strategies are related to desired results;
- Management information systems — developing mechanisms for measuring intermediate performance of staff and organizational practices, as well as for the reporting of accomplishments related to desired outcomes.

Reinventing probation will be a dynamic process. It will demand that those working in the field pay careful attention to state-of-the-art research and evaluation regarding the effectiveness of their own practices.

### **Structural Issues in Re-thinking Probation**

Many structural issues must be considered in the effort to reengineer probation. They start by recognizing that probation officers have very different perspectives and work within very different systems. It is critical that those who take on the task of retooling probation begin by recognizing what they share in common with others. These commonalities represent the strategic starting point for action.

Those involved in reengineering probation share in common the mission of promoting public safety. They likewise share a commitment to provide effective supervision and control over offenders and to achieving outcomes that the public values. Ultimately, they share an energetic and informed willingness to push probation out of centralized offices and bureaucracies into the neighborhoods and street corners within the communities they serve.

There are numerous structural impediments to achieving the vision and accomplishing the strategies for supervision suggested throughout this monograph. Any such effort will produce what Robert Merton called "unintended consequences." Initiatives undertaken with only positive intentions in mind frequently can perversely set off negative consequences that often overtake any gains. With this in mind, probation practitioners must be mindful of four specific impediments to reengineering probation, as well as several steps that might be taken to address them.

### *Case Assignments and Job Responsibilities*

A commitment to community probation will require a fundamental change in the traditional system for assigning cases used by most probation agencies. Rather than merely assigning cases to the next probation officer on the list, case assignments must reflect geographical specialization. New cases should be assigned by local neighborhoods or bounded geographical areas. Probation officers, in turn, will be held accountable for clearly defined supervision activities and outcomes in their area or neighborhood, rather than for the completion of a finite number of assessments or the submission of administrative paperwork.

Many probation officers are locked into a nine to five daily work routine, one they will find very difficult to break. Nonetheless, if such practitioners are to achieve the goals of community probation, they must necessarily work the hours during which they can be most effective in their assigned area. Market research may be done to determine what these hours should be. It is very likely that evening and weekend hours will become part of their everyday work. "Fortress probation" is not a viable option under this model.

The role of the supervisor will, of necessity, undergo a drastic change. The supervisor will become a resource person for their field officers. He or she may also take on the role of ombudsman to the community. In playing such a role, the supervisor may find that the concerns and needs of the community are quite different than those normally pursued by criminal justice system practitioners. In this scheme, the supervisor becomes the individual who removes obstacles and impediments so that the line officers can perform their community-based tasks more effectively.

### *Hiring, Job Description, and Training*

If in the long run probation is to be fundamentally reshaped, developing a successful work force will be dependent on the emphasis placed on job descriptions, hiring and training. Given the extent to which the role of the probation officer is redefined, the job description must reflect the new and expanded responsibilities

## Executive Exchange

---

associated with working in the community. Probation officers will require such skills as community organizing and advocacy, creative problem solving and a capacity to work as much with adults and local stakeholders as with offenders on their caseload.

The hiring decision will likewise need to change and be tailored to the community. It should be decentralized to ensure that staff appropriate to the needs of the community may be hired. Staff should be hired for the particular area in which they will work. In the hiring process those probation staff who have been successful in the field should be used to assist in screening candidates.

Training methods will change as well as probation moves to embrace its new mission. *The adult probation department in Maricopa County in Phoenix, Arizona, provides a model for such change.* New hires there attend a two week training academy followed by a 90-day assignment to a mentorship with a training officer. During the period of mentoring, the probation officer trainee carries a reduced caseload. Within this system, the trainee gains valuable practical experience under the close supervision of an experienced officer. The assignment of a smaller caseload gives the officer a chance to work into the job without being immediately overwhelmed.

### *Caseload, Resources, and Technical Support*

Any effort to reengineer probation will prove unsuccessful unless caseload issues, resources and technical support are addressed. The feasibility of probation officers being held accountable for geographic areas of assignment is dependent on the manageability of caseload sizes. The paradigm shift that is proposed and the new and redefined role of the probation officer as captured in the job description can be achieved *only if caseloads become much smaller than they are now.* Caseloads averaging 100-500 offenders are absurd.

Resources other than personnel will also have to be committed to the effort. To do the job effectively, the field staff must be comprehensively equipped. If the neighborhood storefront or other such location is to become the probation officer's base of operation, then laptop computers, palm corders, cellular phones, and flashlights will become the new tools of the trade.

Technical support is as crucial to probation's relocation to the community as is caseload reduction and an infusion of resources. Clearly, sophisticated yet user-friendly management information systems are essential for communication and information retrieval on a daily basis. Once such systems are in place, they provide for an economy of time management and immediate access to information that cannot be obtained in any other way. This, too, will require fiscal support.

Probation department managers must realize, however, that adequate resources will not come until the public is persuaded that probation is more than a "slap on the wrist," a hollow experience that trivializes the offense, demeans and enrages the victim and emboldens the offender. The transformation of probation from being the under-funded, unappreciated and anemic intervention it all too often is to a sentencing option worthy of public support — both moral and financial — depends critically on the capacity of probation to define itself and its mission coherently and convincingly.

### *Community Involvement and Support*

The work of probation becomes easier to the extent it is genuinely involved with the community. It is essential that partner-

ships be built and sustained with local neighborhood organizations. This increases the leverage that can be maintained over offenders. The Sixth Judicial District in Iowa has also been a leader in surveying its customers, developing partnerships with the community and law enforcement and designing successful treatment programs. In 1997, it developed a comprehensive computerized assessment, MATRIX, to determine appropriate levels of supervision and treatment for targeted offenders. This helped to give the intensive sex offender program less than a 5% failure rate over the past year.

The District has also established a partnership in neighborhood resource centers with law enforcement and neighborhood groups to develop a "Neighborhood Based Supervision" program to intensely supervise offenders on the street, (where they live, work and recreate) in conjunction with the COPS program. Agents participate in weekly staffing meetings with law enforcement partners to target joint activities, and citizens now participate on a Citizens Task Force on Community Justice and a Neighborhood Reparative Board to make offenders under supervision accountable to the people who live in the neighborhood. As a result, the number of crack or disorderly houses in targeted neighborhoods has been reduced from 93 in 1998 to 23 for the same period in 1999.

### Conclusion

The reinvention of probation requires a sustained effort to ensure that traditional internal forces within probation do not stymie progress. These forces almost always create unimaginative organizational cultures. In such environments it is difficult for probation professionals to see the very real possibility of a dramatically different and more viable future — a future where what they do for a living can be discussed proudly with outsiders. In short, reinventing probation requires leadership committed to enforcing violation warrants, supervising offenders primarily in the community rather than in probation offices, and not directing probation officers to avoid dangerous areas — which reduces the possibility of personal harm, but at the same time makes it virtually impossible to be a probation officer! Probation will be reinvented when the probation profession places public safety first, and works with and in the community.

Serious efforts to reinvent probation will give the probation profession the first chance it has had since its earliest years to establish itself as a viable community-based and community placed criminal justice option — an option with real public value and real public support. The Reinventing Probation Council, in partnership with the NAPE, the APPA and the Manhattan Institute's Center for Civic Innovation, looks forward to promoting and assisting such efforts in cities all across the country.

Members of the Reinventing Probation Council and the authors of this 1999 monograph included Chairman **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.** (Massachusetts); **Dan Richard Beto** (Texas); **Brian Coen** (Pennsylvania); **John J. DiIulio, Jr.** (Pennsylvania); **J. Richard Faulkner, Jr.** (Virginia); **Bernard L. Fitzgerald** (Massachusetts); **Irwin Gregg** (Pennsylvania); **Norman Helber** (Arizona); **Gerald R. Hinzman** (Iowa); **Robert Malvestuto** (Pennsylvania); **Mario Paparozzi** (New Jersey); **John Perry** (Vermont); **Rocco Pozzi** (New York); and **Edward E. Rhine** (Ohio).



## BUILDING BRIDGES: ICPA'S 12th ANNUAL CONFERENCE

by

Donald G. Evans

The International Corrections and Prison Association's 12th annual conference was held in Ghent, Belgium, and hosted by the Belgium Federal Public Service of Justice — Prison Service in collaboration with Ghent University Institute for International Research on Criminal Policy on October 24-29, 2010. The conference, attended by 500 delegates from over 60 countries, was the largest conference yet held by this twelve year old association. Once again the conference focused on promoting an exchange of best practices and effective programs from various parts of the world.

Conferences such as this one provide an excellent means for ICPA to act on their mission of promoting and sharing ethical and effective correctional practices aimed at enhancing public safety and healthier communities. Attempting to convene a truly international conference on corrections is a daunting task, especially when you strive for inclusivity. To accomplish this task it is important to be clear about your mission statement or code of ethics. ICPA's code of ethics provides an ethical underpinning to the work they do in fulfilling their role as a voice for ethical corrections worldwide.

Dr. Ed Woznick, in his introduction to the program, stated: "There may be no right or wrong way to many aspects of our lives, but I firmly believe there is a right and a wrong way to do corrections. There may be different ways to do what is right or wrong but there has to be a right way and that is where the ethical stance is so central."

He went on to note that ICPA has a "robust and relevant code of ethics. It is, as it should be, central to our Association and a mandatory requirement to both individual and institutional membership." For members of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE) this is important, and consideration of the ethical position of ICPA is one of the reasons for our Association's affiliation with ICPA. As correctional professionals seek to further advance the development of effective and ethical correctional services international conferences, exchanges, and study tours to various countries are important means for the exchange of information and for dialogue on what works in our efforts to reduce victimization and re-offending. ICPA and NAPE are involved in many of these activities in an effort to provide and receive current information on what is happening in the "world of corrections."

The conference program was divided up into six plenary sessions that addressed issues and programs in Belgium Day (the host country), Latin American Dimensions, European Dimensions, African Dimensions, a North American response to post-conflict issues, and Southeast Asia Dimensions. There were over 125 workshop sessions covering many facets of correctional work by representatives of the participating countries that made for a rich exchange of ideas and issues relevant to developing correctional practice and programming.

Given the rich selection of workshops being offered and the need to make choices on what to attend, it was not possible for one person to report on the total conference! I have selected what

appeared the most relevant to my interests and the interests of readers of *Executive Exchange*. What follows is my report on a keynote address that commenced the conference and two workshops that discussed issues relevant to probation. The majority of the conference dealt with themes related to prisons and prison issues, and as important as these matters are, they didn't contribute to my knowledge and interests in community corrections.

### **Building Bridges: Correctional Best Practices, World-Wide Perspectives**

The keynote address to the conference on the opening day was delivered by Peter van der Sande, Head Director of the Custodial Institutions Agency in Belgium. He spoke to the theme of the conference — "Building Bridges" — and provided an exposition of what this meant as well as a discussion of the gaps that still exist and the need for bridges to cross these gaps. In his speech he noted that corrections has, as a first task, the "execution of sentences that have been imposed on citizens within our legal system from the viewpoint of the safety of society" and we do this in "a prudent and lawful manner, with responsibility for the welfare of the people that have been entrusted to us and within the frameworks given to us."

He pointed out that we cannot do this task alone and that in order to get results we need to cooperate with a number of other organizations and agencies; therefore, there is a need to build bridges. Van der Sande then listed some examples of bridges the delegates can consider:

- Bridges between prison institutions and other organizations, such as municipalities, care institutions, labor and non-governmental organizations;
- Bridges between the inmates of our institutions and their social networks in society, including their families;
- Bridges between countries; and
- Bridges between regions and continents all over the world.

We need to walk over these bridges to see what is on the other side but, more importantly, we need to be able to look back and see ourselves from the other side, he said. He then talked about a difficult bridge to build and to walk over — the bridge between offenders and the community. In an era of punitiveness and political responses to crime that desire to keep prisoners in longer and to institute a number of policies and laws that disqualify or suspend the offender's rights as a citizen, corrections must still find a way to enable the offender to get on with his life after imprisonment. Van der Sande said we need to find ways to "bring prison into the community and the community into prison."

## Executive Exchange

---

Turning to the gaps we need to bridge, van der Sande listed five such gaps that will need our attention if we are to be more effective and efficient as we go forward. The gaps he noted are:

- The gap between the pressure of politics and society for safety and retribution in the short term versus the contributions to safety in the long term;
- The gap in service delivery, for example during an offender's stay in prison we can often only provide a partial contribution to a change or adjustment in the offender's life course;
- The gap that exists between the structures and culture of the organization and the perceived threat to its identity and self-image when outside organizations and partners are asked to participate with the prison;
- The resources gap that exists between political viewpoints and financial reality, the need to secure sufficient and proper capacity for imprisonment; and
- The gap between the need for gradual release versus the fear in society and the role played by the media in either assisting or exasperating the situation.

These are important gaps we need to bridge in our efforts to advance corrections as a relevant service in making our society safer and healthier.

In concluding his address van der Sande noted that we have become more international in our outlook and that many have walked across the bridge to see the other side; but more important, we have looked back and see ourselves as others see us! In the process we have transferred and shared knowledge and expertise, taken back insights and a fistful of business cards that can become a base of contact for future exchanges. Van der Sande closed his address by noting that even if the delegates find their countries have limited resources they can return home with new knowledge and insights and with a more open mind.

### **Transforming New Zealand's Community Probation Services**

One of the few presentations dealing with probation was given by Jane von Dadelnszen, General Manager for Strategy, Policy, and Planning for the New Zealand Department of Corrections. Her presentation focused on the reasons for change in the probation service, the program of change, and the key achievements to date. The Department of Corrections in New Zealand is responsible for both prisons and probation services. This responsibility extends to oversight of 20 prisons, 17 for male offenders and 3 for female offenders, and 140 community probation offices throughout the country. In 2009/2010, 74,000 new community sentences and orders commenced and the service was managing 38,000 community sentences and orders.

Dadelnszen outlined the challenges facing her department. These challenges were similar to those being faced by many other jurisdictions, namely:

- Despite the fact that in New Zealand imprisonment is meant to be used as a means of last resort, they had a high rate of incarceration compared to similar sized countries;

- Similar to other countries, their prison population has been rising rapidly and continues to grow;
- They need to either increase their capacity or reduce the numbers going to prison; and
- There was, they believed, a small window of opportunity to avail themselves of other strategies before having to commit to a building program.

The Government response to these challenges was to adopt both a long term and a short term strategy. In the longer term the Government placed emphasis on developing crime reduction strategies, early intervention polices, and rehabilitation/reintegration programs. For the shorter term, they concentrated on the introduction of electronic bail and an array of non-custodial sentences. The non-custodial sentences included community detention, intensive supervision schemes, and house arrest as a stand-alone sentence.

As a result of these measures there was a dip in the prison population but the forecast was still for a rise above the current prison capacity in the next few years. However, Dadelnszen noted the number of community sentences and orders did increase so that the number more than doubled in the ten year period from 1999/2000 to 2009/2010 (20,000 to 50,000). As a result, she said, the workforce in probation went from 500 staff to 2,300 staff in the same period. During this period the community offender population rose faster than the prison population thus, she said, creating a challenge and a need to manage offenders differently in the community. The following bullet points summarize what is changing in New Zealand's community probation service:

- Focusing on managing the offender rather than the sentence or order;
- Recognizing all elements of probation's programs and not just compliance to the sentence or order;
- Delivering better outcomes for Maori offenders (who represent 44% of the probation population);
- Ensuring resources are used efficiently by targeting higher risk offenders; and
- Developing and implementing a new risk assessment instrument: The Dynamic Risk Assessment of Offender Re-Entry (DRAOR).

This was a very interesting and informative presentation that underscored the value of probation services and of re-entry programming in providing not only relief to prison population pressures but to the provision of public safety measures. I liked the emphasis on moving beyond mere compliance with sentences and orders and looking to offender change and improvement in their life chances.

Dadelnszen concluded her presentation by noting that there had been a high staff compliance with the new standards, unprecedented levels of positive staff engagement in the change effort, and the creation of an online practice center for staff development. It appears that the New Zealand Community Probation Service is

on its way to, in Dadelszen's words "doing the right thing, with the right offender, at the right time."

### The Future of Community Corrections

Steve Pitts, Head of International Relations and External Programs for the National Offender Management Service (NOMS) in the Ministry of Justice for England and Wales, presented an overview of the future of community corrections through the lens of current practices and new directions in the United Kingdom. In the initial part of his presentation he examined some common challenges that included a number being faced by the majority of countries represented at the conference, such as:

- Working with less resources;
- Continuing growth in workload demands;
- Prisons at or beyond full capacity;
- Public expectations of effectiveness, value for money, and local partnerships;
- Changes in offense profiles: family violence, gangs, trafficking, hate crimes and foreign nationals;
- Responding to new regulatory and guidance regimes;
- In light of new approaches, the need to define purpose of community corrections;
- Exploring delivery mechanisms, including the involvement of partners; and
- Emphasis on results: costs and benefits.

Pitts concluded this section by noting that in defining the purpose of community corrections, our choices will vary depending on a country's legislation, economy, traditions, geography, and the strength of the statutory, private, and voluntary sectors. He was clear in stating that if the agency doesn't define its purpose and what it deems success, someone else will!

In the next section of his presentation Pitts discussed the gains of probation in England and Wales via NOMS from 2000 to 2010. During this period there was the growth and implementation of the "what works" agenda, emphasis on resettlement (re-entry) programs to address problems of social inclusion, emphasis on public protection/credibility, development of national guidance for probation, creation of end-to-end management, the establishment of NOMS, and the development of partnerships, including the public protection panels for high risk offenders. Moving to the future he discussed changes in NOMS and the new focus of taking the best practices from the past and using them to go forward. He sees more emphasis on impact and value analysis, payment for results, and more concern for "what and who" rather than "how" in implementing practice models and programs. He reported that the development of what he called "what works 3" will include emphasis on human and social capital, commissioning services, local partnerships, and community building.

He closed his presentation with a reminder of the importance of international collaboration and discussed his country's collab-

orative relationships with the United Nations, Council of Europe, and European Union. He underlined the value of learning from each other and of sharing with each other the developments in our countries. This was a very instructive and exhaustive overview of the England and Wales experience and the insights were thought provoking. I found it very difficult to summarize this talk and would hope that Pitts has time to commit this to an expanded article so that the material can be studied and shared more broadly.

### IACFP Distinguished Scholar Lecture

The International Association for Correctional and Forensic Psychology (IACFP) continued its welcomed addition to the ICPA program by sponsoring a lecture delivered by a prominent researcher in the field of corrections and forensic psychology. Dr. John Gannon, Executive Director of IACFP, introduced this year's lecturer — Dr. Friedrich Losel of the Institute of Criminology at the University of Cambridge in England, and the Institute of Psychology at University of Erlangen-Nuremberg in Germany. Dr. Losel's lecture was entitled: "What Works in Offender Rehabilitation: A Global Perspective."

He began his lecture by reminding us of how difficult it was to present a global perspective due to the many national differences such as legal regulations, varying penal aims, organizational structures, caseloads, resources, and current crime policies. Losel then examined incarceration rates and noted that since the 1990s imprisonment had been increasing and that the differences were not simply related to crime rates. He noted that the reduction in these rates is possible through effective rehabilitation programs, use of community measures instead of short-term imprisonment, and emphasis on developmental prevention programs. He also noted that in the long term the incarceration rates may decline due to the aging of the correctional population.

Losel then briefly discussed the history of offender rehabilitation and treatment, examined the theoretical bases for rehabilitative programming, and the need for methodologically sound evaluation studies. He made the point that evidence comes by replication and we need many systematic reviews and meta-analysis of good studies to build a strong evidential base. He followed this with a presentation of the three phases of what works research and practice: general proof that rehabilitation works; differentiated analysis of what works best for whom and under what conditions; and integrating the knowledge on single programs into a broader systems perspective and routine practice.

He then turned his attention to a review of the statistical findings of many of the studies and an examination and exposition of effect sizes, randomized studies versus non-randomized studies, and pointing to the need for more studies and to broaden what we are researching. An example of this might be what he meant when he discussed the third generation of what works that includes the perspectives of the importance of personal resources and relationships, importance of social resources, moving beyond rehabilitation as a program or technology, basing what we do on an increasing replicable evidence base, and integrating offending behavior programs within the broader context and range of human services. In ending his lecture Losel returned to themes he addressed before but felt they needed repetition! In terms of the future of rehabilitation we need to remind ourselves of the following:

## Executive Exchange

---

- That crime is not only a criminal justice issue but also a challenge for public health, education, welfare, and the economy;
- The need for continuity of practice and stepwise improvement rather than pendulum swings in crime and social policy;
- The need to take account of cultural adaptation and differences; and
- Create centers of excellence and research and practice clearing houses.

This was a very erudite lecture and packed with information. One of the problems of lectures in the modern era is the use of PowerPoint presentations that do not give you the possibility of a full text complete with references so that the listener can become a reader and spend more time examining the evidence and ideas suggested in the speech.

Of course this is only my need, others will be quite happy to get the many ideas and run with them. Well there will be plenty of ideas in this lecture to run with! For those wishing to know more about Dr. Losel, I would suggest searching out his writings and following what he might be currently engaging his efforts. Again the IACFP is to be thanked for sponsoring this lecture; it was a highlight of the Ghent conference.

### Conclusion

The ICPA conference was a worthwhile event and although the conference's focus was mainly on prison and prison issues there was still an opportunity for community corrections and probation attendees to engage their time and energy purposefully. However, I feel that what is needed in the field of probation in particular is a world congress on probation. I don't care who starts it as long as it is inclusive and if ICPA wishes to bring some of their affiliates together to host such an event I would be supportive. For example the European Organization of Probation (CEP), the National Association of Probation Executives, and the American Probation and Parole Association are all affiliates of ICPA and themselves have extensive affiliate connections that could be used to build momentum for a world congress on probation. Sharing and exchanging with those working in similar fields is an important way to expand knowledge and practice in working with difficult and vulnerable populations.

I look forward to many more opportunities to meet colleagues and friends from various countries dedicated to public safety and reducing victimization and reoffending.

**Donald G. Evans** is a Senior Fellow with the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario. A past President of the American Probation and Parole Association and the International Community Corrections Association, he serves as Chair of the APPA International Committee and is a member of the NAPE International Committee.

## NAPE EVENTS IN CHICAGO

Plan to attend the annual events of the National Association of Probation Executives in Chicago, Illinois, at the Chicago Hilton Hotel on July 23-24, 2011, immediately prior to the 36th Annual Training Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association. The schedule of events is as follows:

NAPE Members Reception  
Saturday, July 23, 2011  
5:00 to 7:00 p.m.

NAPE Awards Breakfast  
Sunday, July 24, 2011  
8:00 to 10:30 a.m.

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

NAPE Board of Directors Meeting  
Sunday, July 24, 2011  
10:30 AM to 12:00 p.m.

The rooms for these events have yet to be assigned. Once the rooms have been identified, a notice will be sent to NAPE members from the Secretariat, along with a RSVP form. In addition, information will be available at the hotel and in the APPA program booklet.

## CEP STATEMENT ON PROBATION VALUES AND PRINCIPLES ESTABLISHED

### Background

In 2007, at the conference on Unity and Diversity in Probation in Tallinn, Estonia, the Board of the European Organization for Probation, commonly referred to as CEP, was asked to articulate a collective vision and a set of basic values on probation.

CEP's previous Board formulated a statement on probation values and principles. It was former Board Member Mary Anne McFarlane who prepared the first draft in consultation with Rob Canton, Professor and Head of Division of Community and Criminal Justice at De Montfort University in Leicester, United Kingdom. He was one of the experts who advised the Council of Europe in drafting the Probation Rules. This Values Statement is now finished.

### Collective Effort

CEP members have reviewed the Values Statement. At the 2010 General Assembly in Malaga, Spain, the statement was adopted. Comments that were made at the General Assembly have now been incorporated into the statement.

### A Well Defined Context

The delivery of the common values statement is an important step for CEP. It will be useful in its work. Particularly because the CEP values accompany the Council for Penological Co-operation's Recommendation on probation. CEP members and new and developing probation services may find a well defined set of values helpful since it sets the common ground between European probation services, reflecting the core elements which bind us together.

The General Assembly of CEP asked the CEP Board to articulate a collective vision and set of basic values that would be shared by all members. This statement aims to set out the vision and values of CEP and was presented for debate at the 2010 General Assembly for adoption.

CEP believes that this statement will be useful for its work in the European Union and with the Council of Europe. New and developing probation services may also find it helpful. CEP is grateful for comments from Professor Rob Canton on this paper, from his position as an advisor to the Council for Penological Co-operation, Council of Europe on the new Probation Rules for Europe. CEP has aimed for consistency with these rules and other guidance from the Council.

Extensive consultation has taken place with members, who gave thoughtful and valuable feedback and the board has formally discussed drafts of this paper on two occasions. CEP has tried to find the common ground between European Probation Services, reflecting the core elements which bind us together.

### Introduction to Statement

Probation works with offenders in the community to protect the public and to reduce offending. The Probation Services across Europe work with offenders in the community, on court orders, through community sanctions and measures, or on release from custody. Probation work has its roots in voluntary and religious organisations working with offenders over two hundred years ago. It is now a major force within the criminal justice system, offering a range of community-based options to the courts, with skilled and professional staff. It also supports and seeks to rehabilitate and resettle those from penal institutions who are being reintegrated back into the community. Probation agencies are distinguished by their emphasis on assistance, guidance and persuasion in working with offenders.

Society has a duty to protect the vulnerable, including those who may be victims of crime. In some jurisdictions, probation agencies offer services to victims of crime. Probation staff members work with people who are in the main from the most disadvantaged and socially excluded groups in society, who themselves have frequently been victims of crime as well as perpetrators. Some of them pose a significant risk to themselves and to others which must be managed very carefully in the community. However we believe that in principle people are able to change their behaviour and take responsibility for their actions. Probation gives them that chance to change. The harm caused by offenders to victims and communities should be acknowledged by them and further harm reduced by effective sanctions. Offenders are encouraged to make reparation for this harm.

### Beliefs and Values

Probation stands for the following beliefs and values:

1. Probation works towards rehabilitation through working with offenders to help and encourage them to lead law-abiding lives. This includes creating opportunities for offenders, helping them to acquire the skills they need to make good use of these opportunities and motivating them to do so.
2. Probation services play an essential role in contributing to a reduction in the prison population. Community sanctions and measures are appropriate for many people who are now in prison or remand centres and in many cases community intervention would be both fairer and more effective.
3. Social inclusion is a requirement of social justice and a key guiding principle in probation practice. Since people who do not have fair and reasonable access to the services and institutions of civil society (social exclusion) are

more likely to offend, probation's commitment to social inclusion also helps to reduce offending. Motivation, the opportunity to make reparation and positive citizenship experiences for offenders can achieve better results than simply punishment and blame alone.

4. Probation services must work in close partnership with the agencies of civil society and individual volunteers, to increase offenders' social inclusion. Co-ordinated and complementary inter-agency work is required for meeting the complex needs of offenders.
5. Each person is unique and their differences are to be respected and valued. Probation services shall ensure that in all their work they respect the diversity of those who use their services and challenge all unfair discrimination. To ensure that everyone is dealt with well and fairly, services must take full account of individual circumstances and needs.
6. All probation practices must respect the interests and rights of victims of crime, as well as working with offenders to make them aware of the harm that they have caused. Offenders should be held accountable for the hurt they have caused victims and their families through the sentences of the court. Probation services should develop and support development of restorative justice programs and elements in their judicial practice.
7. Some offenders pose significant risks to the public, but this risk can often be managed and reduced through co-ordinated inter-agency public protection arrangements. Although probation and the police often lead these arrangements, for effectiveness they must be able to call on the skills and willing commitment of a range of relevant agencies.
8. One important measure of society is how offenders are treated. Since sanctions administered by probation services are imposed as a consequence of an offence, they constitute a form of penalty and involve a limitation of the rights of offenders. Any restrictions on offenders' rights must be justifiable either as a retributive penalty or as a requirement of public protection. In accordance with the European Convention on Human Rights, restrictions on offenders' rights must not exceed what is proportionate to the seriousness of the offence or what is necessary to protect the public from a real risk of substantial harm. The concept of proportionality should also extend to mandatory conditions of community sanctions and measures and to interventions through specific work programmes to effect change.
9. Probation aims to be a reliable and credible sanction in the eyes of the judiciary and the public. The aspects of control which are built into community sanctions and measures are therefore an important visible demonstration of the consequences of the offence. Supervision should aim to combine assistance and control, appropriate to the individual case and risk profile. Probation can build on the positive aspects, aspirations and strengths of individuals who have offended. Research suggests that building on strengths is particularly effective in achieving desistance.
10. Where probation works with defendants before conviction, any intervention must take place with their consent and shall be without prejudice to their right to be presumed innocent. Probation staff need to ensure that there are no conflicts of interest which may affect any subsequent court proceedings.
11. High quality assessments and advice to the judiciary are central to effective interventions with offenders. These assessments must be objective and not meant to serve as mitigation documents. Their prime purpose is to inform the judiciary and accurately offer a professional opinion of the offender.
12. National law shall specify the agencies that provide probation and aftercare to offenders, their duties and responsibilities and their relationship with the authorities and other agencies.
13. Work with offenders by probation services should involve research-based methods which have demonstrated effectiveness. Probation Services have a professional duty to contribute to the advancement and dissemination of knowledge about the delivery and effectiveness of the services they administer. The delivery of effective services is supported by being carried out by well qualified and appropriately skilled staff to carry out probation work.
14. Probation agencies shall be accountable to, and take instruction from, the appropriate authorities and shall be subject to monitoring and inspection. In specific cases, they shall give account to the judiciary or other criminal justice agencies under whose authority they undertake their work.
15. Probation services shall be accorded an appropriate standing as one of the main criminal justice agencies, with due recognition of their expertise, and shall be adequately resourced. Probation staff members need to be well trained, developed and supported to achieve successful outcomes.
16. Probation agencies shall explain their work and its significance to the public, to criminal justice and to other agencies. Their policies and practices must be open and must command the confidence and trust of the community. They should be willing to continuously improve.
17. Users of the services of probation must have access to a clear and impartial procedure for investigating any complaints.
18. Probation agencies throughout Europe and wider afield should seek both to work collaboratively and wherever possible to support legislation and practice that achieves this aim.

## NEW PROBATION NATIONAL STANDARDS PUBLISHED FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF OFFENDERS IN ENGLAND AND WALES

According to a report from the Ministry of Justice for England and Wales, revised Probation National Standards for the Management of Offenders were published on April 5, 2011, and will be implemented over the next year. The standards will allow frontline probation staff to manage their work with offenders as the risks of each case demands, using their knowledge and drawing on their professional training and experience. The Government is committed to reducing bureaucracy and the changes will scrap unnecessary tasks, recording and, monitoring.

According to a Ministry of Justice spokesman: "We are committed to allowing frontline staff to better use their judgment and professional skills to cut reoffending and protect the public. Offender managers must be able to focus their work on the most serious offenders, they should not be spending their time on tick-box exercises. The new standards will remove the unnecessary proscription and red tape that restricts frontline decision making."

### National Standards for the Management of Offenders

The National Standards for the Management of Offenders (2011) provide a practice framework for practitioners and managers. They are published by the Secretary of State under the provisions of the Offender Management Act 2007 (Chapter 21: Part 1, paragraph 7).

One of their functions is to relate those activities covered by the Standards to the objectives of implementing sentences of the court in accordance with one or more of the purposes of sentencing:

- The punishment of offenders;
- Reducing crime;
- The reform and rehabilitation of offenders;
- The protection of the public; and
- The making of reparation by offenders to persons affected by their offenses.

Tasks to be employed in the implementation of the Standards include the following:

### Record Keeping

Contacts with or with reference to the offender are recorded using designated recording systems; and

Records are kept safely and securely, and are accessible to appropriate parties.

### Court Services

Courts are provided with information to support their decision making; and

Sentencing decisions and information from court proceedings are communicated to all relevant parties.

### Assessment

An assessment is completed and information shared; and

A report is prepared for decision making bodies.

### Allocation of Offender Manager

The identity of the offender manager is unambiguous at all times.

### Plan the Sentence

A written sentence plan is prepared post-sentence.

### Implement the Sentence

Purposeful contact is maintained during a custodial element of the sentence;

Purposeful contact is made with the offender promptly after order commencement/release on license;

The sentence plan is implemented;

Engagement with community resources is promoted as an integral part of implementing the sentence plan;

Transfer is administered to maintain effective management of the offender and the sentence; and

The sentence is enforced.

### Review

The assessment is reviewed and updated; and

The sentence plan is reviewed and updated.

### Evaluate

An evaluation of the extent to which the objectives of the sentence have been achieved is undertaken; and

Termination of the order/license is managed.

### *Victims*

The statutory duties in respect of victims are undertaken.

### *Approved Premises*

Prospective residents are identified and referred;

A residence plan is prepared; and

Residents undertake a planned program.

### **Community Order Requirements**

#### *Activity Requirement*

The offender is prepared for the activity requirement; and

The offender undertakes the activity requirement.

#### *Alcohol Treatment Requirement*

The offender is prepared for the alcohol treatment requirement; and

The offender undertakes the alcohol treatment requirement.

#### *Attendance Center Requirement*

The offender is prepared for the attendance center requirement; and

The offender undertakes the attendance center requirement.

#### *Curfew Requirement*

The offender is prepared for the curfew requirement/license condition/Home Detention Curfew (HDC); and

The offender undertakes the curfew requirement/license condition/Home Detention Curfew (HDC).

#### *Drug Rehabilitation Requirement*

The offender is prepared for the drug rehabilitation requirement/drug treatment license condition; and

The offender undertakes the drug rehabilitation requirement/drug treatment license condition.

#### *Exclusion Requirement*

The offender is prepared for the exclusion requirement; and

The offender undertakes the exclusion requirement.

### *Mental Health Treatment*

The offender is prepared for the mental health treatment requirement; and

The offender undertakes the mental health treatment requirement.

#### *Program Requirement*

The offender is prepared for the program requirement; and

The offender undertakes the program requirement.

#### *Prohibited Activity Requirement*

The offender is prepared for the prohibited activity requirement; and

The offender undertakes the prohibited activity requirement.

#### *Residence Requirement*

The offender is prepared for the residence requirement; and

The offender undertakes the residence requirement.

#### *Supervision Requirement*

The offender is prepared for the supervision requirement; and

The offender undertakes the supervision requirement.

#### *Unpaid Work Requirement*

The offender is prepared for the unpaid work requirement; and

The offender undertakes the unpaid work requirement.

Surrey and Sussex Probation Trust carried out a Professional Judgment Project pilot in the development of the new approach to improve services. The pilot showed that staff had more purposeful and better focused contact with offenders when they were allowed to exercise their professional judgment in deciding how to work with each individual.



## THE BUSINESS OF PROBATION: MANAGEMENT INTEGRATING BUSINESS PRACTICES WITH EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICES AND PRINCIPLES TO ACHIEVE EXCELLENT OUTCOMES

by

Ellen Fabian Brokofsky

As President of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE), I have the incredible opportunity to share information with my colleagues in our publication *Executive Exchange*. Unfortunately, with this opportunity comes a sense of responsibility to not only offer information, but meaningful information that may be of some value to those in positions of probation leadership.

In that vein, this article, and those I offer in the future during my tenure as President of NAPE, may lack literary integrity, highly researched scholarly principles, or profound words of wisdom. I intend to write simply about the accomplishments, the challenges, the changes, and the experiences of being a leader in this always challenging business of probation.

In 2003, having been a life-long learner, a probation officer for almost 30 years and a Chief Probation Officer for 13 years, I entered graduate school. Long before that I decided it made sense to apply business principles to probation service delivery, so I pursued a master's degree in business management rather than criminal justice. Actually I thought I was nearing the end of my career and had no ambition to pursue any higher level position in probation administration. I was anxious to apply what I was learning on the job as Chief Probation Officer. God does have a sense of humor though as I became re-directed, applied for and accepted the position of Nebraska's Probation Administrator in 2005.

From my experience in this role and my education, I developed a perspective that serves as my foundational belief. That is probation's business of serving the public required a business model that, when implemented, would produce the best outcomes. Coincidentally, it was during that time I learned about the new integrated model of evidence-based principles that was promoting new promising probation practices. So the melding of business and evidence-based principles inspired every leadership decision I made then and now.

Deciding that productive citizens and consequently safer communities were the intended outcomes of probation service delivery in Nebraska meant embracing new ways of doing business. Believing that achieving certain positive outcomes was actually a business practice that required the careful and quality implementation of principles and practices by capable management and line staff was an important first step. The process began with the evidence-based practices (EBP) integrated model as a guide.

Determining probation's purpose, then building two operational models to implement that purpose, provided the detail to the road map of the future. Both models were called Community Safety Impact Models — so staff would always be reminded of the intended outcome of these transformational templates, and individualized for both juveniles and adults. Specialized programmatic responses were developed for certain significant pop-

ulations. More will be written about these models and these new specialized programs in future publications.

Stakeholders were identified and engaged. Developing the integrity of the product via intense training, a solid implementation plan and the development of a template for quality evaluation of the services and programs was next. Engaging the workforce into believing in the new way of doing business, training these new skills, and then assessing and re-assessing their ability to implement the new programming was incredibly challenging.

Understanding this process of change was tough and that many staff would complain loudly of poor morale and too demanding work was expected but tough to experience. Instilling and encouraging pride and confidence in those delivering the product while simultaneously adjusting and evaluating their progress in implementing the new business principles proved to be grueling. This required constant and consistent intervention by the managers as at any point re-direction or a teachable moment could occur. Connecting all the dots to paint the picture of the new business was critical and required a variety of communication methods for both staff and stakeholders delivered using a variety of mediums.

Absolutely essential to this re-engineering of Nebraska Probation was the ongoing development and cultivation of leaders and managers who were knowledgeable and in the right positions to carry out the transformation of the system. It was important these managers aligned themselves to the same evidence-based and business practices with their staff that management wanted probation officers to implement with probationers; a concept known as parallel practice. In those Nebraska Probation districts where the district leaders and managers were able to embrace these expectations, successful implementation practices occurred faster, were more structurally sound, and more promising outcomes began to emerge.

This article's focus is on these tangible expectations, compiled from the evidence-based principles and practices of the integrated model and various basic guidelines related to best practice in business leadership. This article does not address the differences between the definitions of leader versus manager nor examine any particular business model. In the Nebraska experience, certain state level administrative staff and Chief Probation Officers were identified as leaders. Others in supervisory positions were deemed managers. Training curriculum was tailored for each group. However, for the general purpose of this article, the words leader, manager, and supervisor are used interchangeably to depict any person who is in a management position.

Basically the expectations for leadership required an investment by all the managers in not only committing to a new vision and mission, but, more importantly, to be part of creating both. One of the first acts as Probation Administrator was to ask all

## Executive Exchange

---

the managers to solicit input from their staff as to where they believed the system should be in the future. Then all of management across the state was gathered together in a centralized location to build the new vision and mission for the system.

Once the direction was set, a code of ethics was developed in a process involving a combination of line staff and management. Most of probation's management had been officers at one time. Most were criminal justice majors with limited "formal" management training yet in some cases had anywhere from zero to thirty years of administrative experience. However, during the early 2000s, each Chief Probation Officer and Chief Deputy participated in and received a management certificate offered by the University of Nebraska/Lincoln. Some Chief Probation Officers individually pursued leadership training as well. New expectations for probation's leaders meant changing administrative behaviors that had been in place in some cases for decades.

New expectations also required helping Chief Probation Officers and other managers to model the same behavior they expected to see in their staff. Believing good leaders give their staff the chance to achieve important goals on their own; all of the managers were introduced to the concept of coaching. They were trained to learn the difference between coaching for results rather than demanding results. Fortunately, via Nebraska's Community Corrections Act of 2003, probation fees for adult probationers supported the costs of the intensive statewide training of managers. Some new management staff applied for and were accepted into an exemplary Executive Management Training Program offered by the National Institute of Corrections in association with the National Association of Probation Executives entitled "Orientation for New Probation and Parole Chief Executives."

Being vigilant in terms of knowing how to take the temperature of their districts was key to the leaders knowing when to apply appropriate interventions through coaching, educating, engaging individuals or simply providing information. Taking the districts' temperature required heavy engagement by management initially. There were more frequent staffing or team meetings, and regular drop-ins to check with the officer about barriers to implementation or opportunities to observe new skills. Caretaking a positive culture within each district was seen as a primary role of local management with aid and coaching from the Office of Probation Administration. What became apparent quickly was there was a statewide culture of "officer ownership" of their individual caseloads. Filling in and covering caseloads occurred only when officers were on leave. Shifting the focus from officer driven to probationer driven case management required officers to rely less on their responsibility regarding the number of contacts with a probationer and more on the progress a probationer made in regard to personal behavior and adherence to the probation order. Probation officers became change agents because management guided and continually monitored the change process. The mantra of probation's leadership became "a few baby steps in the right direction were considered major accomplishments."

The behavior managers wanted officers and staff to encourage and re-enforce in the field was exhibited and trained first in the office. Probation's leadership was asked to practice being the best listeners they could be. Loyalty was expressed and reinforced as an attribute of great leaders and managers. A positive attitude was described as an absolute necessity of leadership.

Passionate leaders were continually praised for their enthusiasm. Fear was identified as a natural component of leadership and those who were in a supervisory position and above were encouraged to face their fear and walk through it understanding others would be there to help.

As the business of probation is focused on factors that promote positive behavioral change, leaders must exhibit and expect ethical behavior from themselves and their staff. The ethical decision is always the right decision. It's often said the bad times, rather than the good times, separate the leaders from the managers. Leaders take responsibility when something goes wrong and suggest solutions to problems rather than complaining about them. This behavior from management became an expectation rather than a request.

Many of our current management staff had difficulty practicing delegation, an important management practice. Many times we heard them say, "I would never ask anyone to do a job I was not willing to do myself." It was important to help all of the managers understand that doing the work for an employee most often wasn't actually helping the employee. Management's well-meaning assistance sometimes prevented the employee from developing a personal skill set and a sense of accomplishment after the task was mastered. Sometimes this helping hand actually perpetuated the line staff's belief that management really didn't do that much as they had time available to do someone else's job — until a person walks in the shoes of a manager and does as a manager does is there an understanding of the challenges of management! It also blurred the lines between managers. This was particularly evident with 2nd- and 3rd-level managers, and line staff. Additionally, utilizing a manager who is generally paid more than those the manager supervises to complete a non-management job is a violation of the most fundamental smart business tenets around sensible resource utilization.

Attempting to change this basic belief of existing management was one of the most difficult leadership practices confronted by the transformational leadership initiative. Simply said, management wanted to be liked and accepted. Believing a perception by the staff that the manager wasn't a team player and wouldn't "pitch in" to do the work could make the manager both ineffective and disrespected. There was some pushback from the managers that the system was adding "more" responsibilities to the line staff with no new staff. It was discovered that a very important foundational message of the new transformation had not been understood or operationalized to a degree that managers understood it. The message was the new way of probation doing business was not about adding responsibilities, rather it was about doing business differently.

It turned out that re-visiting the reasoning behind probation's new way of doing business was not a one-time or two-time event. As noted in most EBP implementation literature, we found that the message sometimes needed to be delivered 25 times or more to be heard by both leadership staff.

Although the problem of discomfort with delegating was seen to some degree across the state, it was most notably seen in the smaller, more rural, probation districts. Re-visiting the reasons behind the transformation and clarifying the role of the probation officer versus the role of management and the deliverables associated with each began to help address this problem. Officers and staff were re-educated about their changing roles in this new EBP world while they improved their skills in

case management and caseload management and learned the new skills of motivational interviewing and cognitive group facilitation. The role of management also became more defined and clear as the business of Probation began to change. Managers understood doing the job was not the same as being able to evaluate whether the job was being done correctly. They were trained in new methods of evaluating the work product for quality rather than contacts, assessing the knowledge, capacity and needs of the officer in light of their assigned workload, recognizing and lauding strengths in both the work product and the staff member, and motivating staff as well as immediately addressing needs or issues. Although change is not easy, and this change in culture is no exception, the strategy of clarifying the roles of the managers and the officers in line with evidence-based practices and good business practice while still a “work in progress” seems to be working.

Directing an employee to complete a task without guidance and administrative expectations instills fear and reduces the chance the employee will complete the task successfully. Training and coaching leaders and managers in both business and evidence-based practice focused on improving their ability to set clear expectations around a task, assessing their ability to complete a task, and providing the “appropriate” level of supervisory engagement and assistance while engaged in the task. Training these foundational principles was necessary for the managers to understand not only what was expected of them as managers, but also why applying evidence-based and business practices improved their management skills and simply made sense.

Again, these examples illustrate the concept of parallel practice at work. This analogy is comparing the leader/manager and employee’s relationship to the relationship in the evidence-based world between the probation officer and the probationer. For example, in the business of probation after assessment some probationers are able to carry out their court-ordered conditions with minimal engagement of a probation officer, but with the heavy influence of a treatment provider or a series of community resources. Other probationers require an intensive level of engagement by both a probation officer in cooperation with a network of community stakeholders. Similarly, managers require the tools and abilities to assess the skill level of their employees, target appropriate supportive interventions to develop or increase their skill, and determine the required level of engagement/investment of the manager to best assist the employee to master the skill and be successful. Important in both the world of business and evidence-based practice is the value of consistent formal and informal evaluation and feedback.

Throughout the introduction of evidence-based principles and practices into the business of Nebraska Probation, Chief Probation Officers and others in management positions were personally visited in their districts, were provided frequent administrative feedback as to their progress in leading the transformational change process, were introduced to the concept and value of understanding parallel practice, and were told that by ascribing to this new world of leadership some may find themselves unable to meet the new “raised bar” in management practices.

Recalling an account of a CEO of a Fortune 500 company describing how he and his top level executives had just finished the development of a new business model for his company illustrates this notion that the successful “business practice” of the organization equates to positive organizational outcomes. He

said the process of change was excruciating and all the executives knew that by the time they were finished some would plan themselves right out of a job given their consolidation and profit considerations. In fact, he said following the planning process his position had been changed so significantly he decided to retire. As public servants charged to protect the public, by ensuring competent and capable staff are actually assisting probationers to change behavior, the responsibility to create the vision and the new course of direction is no less necessary or painful.

The Nebraska experience of transformation was no different. Of the fourteen Chief Probation Officers in place in 2006 (the first year of probation’s transformation), two Chiefs were promoted to Deputy Administrator positions, two Chiefs declined to remain as Chiefs but remained in the system, one in a newly-created district position; two Chiefs were not selected as Chiefs when their districts were merged but remained as Supervisors, three Chiefs decided to retire, and one Chief stepped down into a field service non-management staff position. Twelve of the fourteen Chief Probation Officers in the Nebraska Probation System have been appointed since 2006.

This process of changing organizational leadership in Nebraska evolved as a result of the implementation of a new vision, mission, and business practice — not for a lack of dedication of those in leadership positions. All of the Chief Probation Officers in 2006 were devoted to the transformation of probation and committed to the implementation of evidence-based principles and practices.

This significant change in management occurred over a five-year period and was unprecedented in the 50 years of Nebraska Probation’s history. Yet, the importance of placing the right people in the right places with the necessary knowledge and skills in order to achieve the goals of the transformation of the business of probation trumped the long collegial relationships all the Chiefs shared. This is just another example of the concept of parallel practice in the successful merger of business and evidence-based practice.

From the perspective of the Nebraska Probation experience, integrating business and evidence-based practices into the world of probation management increases the probability of achievable improved probationer outcomes which translate into improved and enhanced community safety.

**Ellen Fabian Brokofsky** is the Administrator of the Nebraska Probation System; in addition, she is President of the National Association of Probation Executives.

## PRAGMATIC SUPERVISORY RESPONSE TO NEWLY ASSIGNED ADULT PROBATION PERSONNEL

by

Andrea Jackson  
and  
Robert L. Bingham

---

In April 2009, the Adult Division of the Marion Superior Court Probation Department, based in Indianapolis, Indiana, initiated a partnership with the City of Indianapolis' Training and Development Division to implement a pilot program known as the High Performance Leadership Institute. This program was intended to assist adult probation officers in readying themselves for promotional advancement. The program was inspired and designed by the Department's Adult Probation Division, with major guidance and assistance provided by John Galloway, Manager of Training and Development for the City of Indianapolis.

As part of the year long program, participants were required to attend over two dozen trainings scheduled over the twelve month period. Course offerings included such topical subjects as: time management and delegation; motivating employees; the one minute manager; building a team; and ethics and confidentiality. An intense practicum — 12 nine hour sessions with probation supervisors — was required, as well as completion of self assessment exercises. As a final requirement, participating adult probation officers were tasked with developing a personal project which reflected special interest, but also demonstrated knowledge gained from the multiple training offerings. Projects were presented at the conclusion of the initial institute; these presentations were attended and graded by administrative representatives from Probation and Training and Development.

What is presented below are two pragmatic checklists designed for newly hired or transferred employees and a first steps guide for recently promoted supervisors. These materials were drawn from Marion Superior Court Adult Probation Officer Andrea Jackson's High Performance Leadership Institute's project and offer responsive and sensitive direction for both the newly promoted supervisor and any supervisor's role with new or transferred employees. These guides reflect local operational references and programs and can easily be modified to apply to any community corrections field of operation.

### New Adult Probation Officer Orientation Checklist

1. HR manual is located in OTIS (On-line Time and Information System). OTIS is where our timesheets are currently tabulated. Timesheets need to be updated daily or in advance (for vacations/requested time off)
2. Supervisor Phone Information:
  - Office
  - Cell
  - Home
3. Locating a City or County employee:
  - Contact switchboard operator at 327-3200
  - Microsoft Outlook Address Book

4. Adding or changing personal Microsoft Outlook email information (e.g., title, name phone, etc.)
5. Do you have an office key? Desk key? Filing cabinet key?
6. Copier code: \_\_\_\_\_
7. Operating fax machine
8. Individual mail box location
9. Voice mail operation
10. Do you have an identification badge?
11. Tour of the office
12. Demonstrate all printers/copy machine locations
13. Explain supplies locations
14. In your office, do you have the following?
  - Post-its
  - Stapler
  - Hole punch
  - Scissors
  - Pens
  - Tabs
  - Black marker
  - Paper
  - Filing cabinet
  - Bookcase
  - Organizational drawers
15. Do you have a list of substance abuse agencies? Anger Management agencies? Domestic Violence agencies?
16. Explain parking pass situation for City-County Building from satellite offices. Show the sign-in/out procedure.
17. Explain field car policy, field book, accident protocol, etc.
18. Explain satellite office parking.
19. Detail the security code for the assigned satellite office.
20. Always use the front door and report to work through the lobby. The back door requires special permission to utilize.
21. Explain satellite office entry/exit protocol.

22. Explain emergency response protocol (tornados, power outages, etc.).

**Supervisor and New Employee Checklist**

1. How would you like to receive praise?
  - In front of a group?
  - In private?
  - By email?
  - Not as an individual but it is OK as a member of the team?
2. How do you like to be addressed?
  - Nickname: If yes, what is yours? \_\_\_\_\_
  - Ms. (last name)?
  - Mr. (last name)?
  - First name?
  - Title?
3. How should I correct your errors?
  - In private?
  - By email?
  - In person
  - Hand written note?
4. If a conflict ever arises between us, we may discuss it in person one-on-one, but where do you prefer to discuss it?
  - In my office?
  - In your office?
  - In another location of your choice?
5. In thinking about your work environment, do you prefer?
  - A lot of structure?
  - Less structure?
  - A more active environment?
  - A quiet environment?
  - Your office door open?
  - Your office door closed?
6. Do you prefer to primarily communicate via?
  - Phone?
  - Email?
  - In person?
7. When is your energy level typically the highest, in the?
  - Morning?
  - Afternoon?
  - Evening?
8. Do you feel you can mentally focus better in the?
  - Morning?
  - Afternoon?
  - Evening?
9. If I say something incorrect in a unit meeting, would you feel comfortable in correcting me in the meeting? Yes No
10. What are some of the reasonable changes you would like see implemented at this office?
11. What are you expectations for me as a supervisor? (Explain my expectations here)

12. What can I do to motivate you and keep you motivated?
13. What practices and behaviors did you like about your past supervisors?
14. What things of your past supervisors done that upset you, infuriated you, and that you wish they did not do?
15. What do you respect the most about your past supervisors?
16. How do you feel about my implementing changes? Does it make you nervous or are you happy with status quo?
17. How do you feel about evidence based practices, case planning, and the direction this department is heading?
18. Do you have any other information you would like for me to know that will help us having a better working relationship?
19. Do you have any specific questions for me? (I am open to discuss.)

The checklists previously detailed are simple, yet supportive extensions to be utilized by probation supervisors with newly assigned staff. The value of the checklists is underscored by a common sense practicality — which can be frequently overlooked or ignored as officers are assigned or transferred — and is respectful of the individual’s need for orientation. A further benefit is the immediate message projected by the assigned supervisor that the individual officer is valued as both an employee and an individual who reflects unique needs possibly not shared by fellow officers. As much as anything, this uncommon sensitivity demonstrated by the assigned supervisor towards a newly assigned officer sets the tone for a supportive and responsive relationship which, in the long run, will enhance the officer’s ability to best supervise assigned probationers.

**Andrea Jackson** is an Adult Probation Officer with the Marion Superior Court Probation Department in Indianapolis, Indiana. **Robert L. Bingham**, a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives, is Chief Probation Officer of the Marion Superior Court Probation Department in Indianapolis, Indiana.

### FROM THE BOOKSHELF

*Executive Exchange* welcomes reviews on books and periodicals dealing with community corrections, correctional policy, social issues and crime, research and evaluation of correctional programs, and management and leadership issues.

Frequent contributor Donald G. Evans, a Senior Fellow with the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario, provides two interesting reviews, one on a book dealing with gangs as a social phenomenon, and the other on the theory of rehabilitation as it relates to current correctional practices.

#### THE PERVASIVENESS OF GANGS

---

Review of *Gangs* by Richard Swift, Groundwood Books, House of Anansi Press, Toronto, 2011, pp. 144 (paperback).

---

If you live in a large urban area you will not be a stranger to media accounts of gang activity, shootings and youth homicides. There is an increased interest in gangs and their activities both in the community and in correctional institutions. Probation and parole agencies pay more attention to gang involved offenders than in previous decades. The literature continues to grow and a considerable amount of the literature is contributed by journalists and a smaller amount by academics. This research contribution to the literature on gangs is by Richard Swift, an experienced journalist with an international reputation and current editor of the *Internationalist* magazine. *Gangs* is one of the Groundwork Guides series of small, readable works that provide an overview of key contemporary political and social issues. Swift's book consists of eight clear and concise chapters and two appendices that give information about gang vocabulary and a historical gang timeline. The author concentrates on youth gangs (as opposed to organized crime syndicates), that number in the tens of thousands and are present in a growing number of cities around the world.

In the first chapter Swift establishes the pervasiveness of gangs and goes on to make two interesting observations. He comments that gang names serve at least three purposes: to raise fear, establish an outcast identity and promote internal loyalty. Commenting on recent research he also notes that gang organization is limited by the political space available, for example consider the following limitations to gang formation:

- Authoritarian and repressive regimes;
- Societies with strong religious orientations;
- Less space for self-organized youth gangs where the criminal scene is dominated by adult criminal gangs; and
- Countries with extensive social welfare networks.

Chapters two to four deal with economic issues that the author suggests are the means for creating a fertile ground for youth gangs to form. In these chapters he surveys and analyzes academic gang literature, examines classic gang studies, and looks at the role of immigration and the problems of surplus populations gathering into urban areas. Using these studies he argues for the role of poverty in the creation and sustaining of youth gangs. Next he discusses the growth of an underground economy, what he calls a "sea of illegality" that floats the emerging gangs. There is a discussion of the war on drugs, gang economics and

institutionalized gangs. The last chapter in this section brings the discussion to gangs and their communities which he considers to be poor neighborhoods with lower social economic sectors that have few opportunity structures for youth — what we have come to call "the projects."

In chapters five and six Swift addresses the issue of the appeal of gangs and discusses the going global of gang culture. There is a discussion of "gangster rap" and the issue of guns is explored. Addressing the growth of gangs in developing countries, post-communist states as well as closer to home the author discusses the politics of gangs in response to such events as: a retreat from justice, post-liberation blues, and criminological state (corruption problems).

Chapter seven consists of a discussion of the various methods used to contain youth gangs, methods that in the author's opinion constitute an assault on youth. Remembering that the author is discussing gangs in every part of the world, where some of these methods are more egregious than others. He identifies six methods such as no-go areas where the authorities refuse to intervene, police sweeps on neighborhoods, tough sentencing, social cleansing in some countries, non-criminal sanctions (disqualifications and removal of benefits such as welfare and housing), and incarceration.

In what appears to have become a predator's world the author is concerned about our future with gangs and recommends what we should do in his conclusion. Swift suggests four possible courses of action. First, he suggests putting an end to the war on drugs and considering the non-criminalization policy for drug purchase and use. Secondly, he suggests a change in police tactics that are more intelligence-based and substitute the hard hand for the friendly hand (examples are gleaned from the Boston ceasefire approaches). Thirdly, he would like to see more uses made of social entrepreneurial alternatives to gangs. Lastly, he wants us to expend energy in getting guns off the streets and gives as examples a number of familiar approaches such as money or other exchange items for guns, and an amnesty for turning in guns.

The future plan also needs to include, as the author notes: "A commitment to understanding what is actually going on in the streets and using resources intelligently to deal with youth issues before they reach the stage of violent institutionalized gangs is key" and "Street gangs need to be engaged on a number of different levels — the criminal justice system certainly, but also at the economical and cultural levels."

This is a lively introduction to the subject of street gangs and doesn't shy away from controversial recommendations. It is written from a strong point of view and definitely offers no solace to neo-liberal approaches.

Donald G. Evans

## A THEORY OF REHABILITATION?

Review of *Rehabilitation: Beyond the Risk Paradigm* by Tony Ward and Shadd Maruna, Routledge, London and New York, 2007, 204 pp. Paperback.

Correctional services are well into the second decade of evidence-based practice and although the language of EBP appears in nearly all correctional conferences, workshops, and mission statements, it is not obvious that the majority of the advocates or practitioners have a clear theoretical base for their enthusiastic promotion of EBP. I recall on a number of occasions asking participants in workshops if they had read *The Psychology of Criminal Conduct* by Don Andrews and James Bonta, a book that is now in its 5<sup>th</sup> edition, and being surprised at the very few who had read or knew of the book's existence! This surprised me, since the majority of those in the workshops or presentations were busy implementing the "risk-need-responsivity" model in their agencies. The book, of course, very clearly lays out the theoretical bases for the RNR model as well as supplying the latest evidence for the model's effectiveness. When it comes to a broader theory of rehabilitation there is limited materials available but Tony Ward and Shadd Maruna have made an effort to both "complement and compliment" the work of Andrews and others working in the RNR paradigm.

The authors of *Rehabilitation* are Tony Ward a professor of clinical psychology at Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand, and Shadd Maruna, a reader in criminology at Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland. Together they have produced a concise overview and a constructive critique of the scientific approach to offender management. The book is one of a series of books in the key ideas in criminology series published by Routledge and consists of seven chapters that cover the main points in the current use of the RNR model and the Good Lives Model (GLM) in addressing offender behavior in an effort to reduce reoffending.

Chapter one succinctly covers the history of how rehabilitation became a dirty word in criminal justice. At the end of the chapter the authors introduce the RNR model as the reigning paradigm in rehabilitation and list a number of current criticisms of the model; they also introduce us to the GLM as an alternative paradigm, which is not surprising as Tony Ward is the originator of this approach. This begins to shape the direction the book will take, an interest in desistance focused, strength-based approach rather than a risk detection and offender management approach. Of course the discussion will end up being more nuanced than that!

Chapter two is a discussion of "what is rehabilitation theory" and, after a brief but useful discussion of what theory is and its usefulness in scientific inquiry, the authors turn their attention to noting the characteristics of a good rehabilitation theory. For them, this means having the ability to do the following:

- Specify the aims of therapy;
- Provide a justification of these aims in terms of its core assumptions about etiology;
- The values underpinning the approach;
- Identify clinical targets; and

- Outline how treatment should proceed in light of these assumptions and goals.

Ward and Maruna consider rehabilitation theory to be a hybrid theory "comprised of values, core principles, etiological assumptions, and practice guidelines."

Chapter three is a good overview of the RNR model together with the authors' attempt to create a reconstructed RNR model in an effort to present the model in its strongest light. The reader will need to decide if they agree with this reconstruction.

The fourth chapter is an evaluation of the RNR model where the authors conclude that "what is needed is a rehabilitation theory that incorporates the strengths of RNR while increasing its scope and capacity to guide correctional workers and engage offenders in the demanding process of lifestyle change."

Chapter five provides an overview of the GLM; this approach is informed by positive psychology and the strengths-based approach to interventions. The model is discussed in terms of its principles, aims, and values. Ward and Maruna conclude that this model "builds upon the clinically useful RNR model, but transcends this model by focusing not just on risks but also on individual motivations to change."

The sixth chapter seeks to evaluate the Good Lives Model by examining the basic assumptions and values, etiological commitments and practice implications. The authors conclude that the GLM is a good rehabilitation theory because it is a relatively coherent, integrated approach with clearly articulated assumptions and etiological commitments. For them the model is useful in creating a constructive environment in offender interventions and thus reduces levels of denial and offense-supportive attitudes. Given the backgrounds of the authors it isn't surprising that they have reached this conclusion. It is clear as one follows their argument that they are looking for a theory of rehabilitation that will avoid the practice of focusing on lowering risk and increasing community safety that it overlooks a basic truth — offenders want a better life, not simply a less harmful one.

In the concluding chapter Ward and Maruna seek to find common ground between the two models of rehabilitation that they have been examining. They have created a vehicle for dialogue and if the proponents of these two models can enter into scholarly discourse about the strengths of each model and work to a practical integration of the assumptions, values and principles that would lead to a stronger theory of rehabilitation practitioners and offenders would be the beneficiaries. It means as the authors note to "take seriously the proposal that the rehabilitation of offenders is both an evaluative and capacity-building process."

This is a thought provoking and challenging book, and although there may be much to disagree with, there is also much that can be agreed upon. It is a good start to a much needed discussion on development of a theory of rehabilitation and a means to better inform our discussion of evidence-based practice.

Donald G. Evans

---

## NEWS FROM THE FIELD

---

### CORBETT TO LEAD MASSACHUSETTS PROBATION DEPARTMENT

In January 2011 **Robert A. Mulligan**, Chief Justice for Administration & Management with the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, appointed **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.**, to serve as the Commissioner of Probation for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Corbett, who was appointed on an interim basis in May 2010 following the suspension of **John O'Brien**, has instituted a range of management reforms to increase the accountability and transparency of the probation service.

"Ron Corbett brings a depth of knowledge on probation best practices along with strong management experience and extensive partnerships in the criminal justice community to strengthen probation at this challenging time," said Mulligan. "Probation is a key public safety entity with a positive history in the judicial branch until recently. We are very fortunate to have a leader of this caliber who can work collaboratively with the executive branch and provide direction to the many hardworking probation officers across the state. Ron, who is widely respected, will issue regular reports on the many initiatives underway in probation."

Mulligan highlighted the importance of establishing stability in the department in the short term given the recent turmoil. Under recently-enacted legislation the position of Commissioner of Probation now carries a five-year term. Mulligan expects to conduct a full search at a point that is appropriate for the organization.

Speaking of his appointment, Corbett said: "I welcome the opportunity to restore probation to administrative excellence and credibility throughout the court system and in the eyes of the public. Going forward, we will focus on further strengthening several key areas. These include the need to establish a culture based on performance management with new metrics and full accountability; finish introduction of a new, validated risk/need classification instrument to form the foundation of our key supervisory practices; insure comprehensive and accurate data systems to enable accurate caseload reporting; continue to enhance relationships with our allied state agencies in the interests of an effective criminal justice system; and insure that all future hires are based on best personnel practices and reflect a commitment to a merit-based system."

Corbett, a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives, served as Deputy Commissioner of Probation from 1993 to 2000 when he was named Executive Director of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court. He also served as Chair of the Reinventing Probation Council of the Manhattan Institute. He teaches criminal justice courses at the University of Massachusetts at Lowell.

A career criminal justice practitioner, Corbett earned a bachelor's degree from Harvard, a master's degree in criminal justice from Northeastern University, and a doctorate in education from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

He is widely published in a number of professional journals, including *Federal Probation*, *Executive Exchange*, *Corrections Management Quarterly*, *Perspectives*, *Sociological Forum*, *Justice Quarterly*, *The Correctional Trainer*, *Law Enforcement Executive Forum*, and *Community Corrections Report*.

Corbett is the recipient of a number of awards and recognitions, including the Sam Houston State University Probation Executive of the Year Award.

### HANNON RETIRES IN PORTER COUNTY, INDIANA

In November 2010 longtime NAPE member **Neil Hannon**, Chief Probation Officer in Valparaiso, Indiana, announced his retirement after 40 years with the Porter County Adult Probation Department and 36 years as the agency's chief.

Hannon, 61, leaves an office of 25 full-time adult probation officers. He is being replaced on an interim basis by Assistant Chief Probation Officer **Steve Meyer**, who plans to apply for the permanent position.

Hannon said he will continue with his highly successful cattle breeding business in Morgan Township.

"It's the right time for the right reasons," said Hannon about his retirement from the field of community corrections. "I feel good about it."

In September 2010 the Probation Officers Professional Association of Indiana (POPAI) awarded Hannon with the Founder's Award. This award is presented to individuals who have significantly contributed to the field of probation in general and specifically to the association.

Because of his leadership, 15 probation officers under his supervision have gone on to become Chief Probation Officers or federal probation officers. He's also trained a number of new judges and worked to make probation more professional as a founding member and President of the POPAI.

POPAI promotes professionalism within the organization by means of legislative lobbying, education and networking; promotes and advances progressive and effective probation practices; supports and promotes standardized probation services throughout the state; and educates the public and enhances community awareness and acceptance of probation as a necessary component of the criminal justice system in Indiana.

Hannon has served the profession as President of the Indiana Correctional Association and by ushering in reforms as chairman of the Probation Officers Advisory Board. In addition to the National Association of Probation Executives and the Probation Officers Professional Association of Indiana, he is a member of the American Correctional Association, American Probation and Parole Association, and Indiana Correctional Association.

In 1995 Hannon received the Order of Augustus, an honorary award presented annually by the Probation Officers Advisory Board of the Judicial Conference of Indiana. It's given to probation professionals whose commitment and personal dedication have exemplified the ideals and philosophy of John Augustus, often referred to as the father of probation.

### PECOR NAMED CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER OF THE YEAR BY CHIEF PROBATION OFFICERS OF CALIFORNIA

In December 2010 Placer County Chief Probation Officer **Stephen G. Pecor** was named Chief Probation Officer of the Year by the Chief Probation Officers of California (CPOC). The organization represents 59 chief probation officers throughout the state



and annually honors an individual who demonstrates excellence and outstanding leadership in their individual department and significantly contributes to the organization and the field of community corrections. Pecor has been the County's top probation officer since July 2006.

"Pecor has a great history of teamwork," said Placer County Supervisor **Jim Holmes**. "No other county in the state has this level of teamwork."

Pecor began his career in Placer County in August 1982 as an Extra Help Group Counselor. He became a permanent Placer County employee on August 6, 1983, as a Group Counselor 1.

He serves on several committees in Placer County, including Criminal Justice Policy Committee, SMART Policy Committee which oversees juvenile services, and PLEA (Placer Law Enforcement Agencies). He also has been directly involved in several legislative items related to the field of corrections. His ability to thoroughly analyze the impacts of the legislative items presented and his ability to "ask tough questions" has greatly contributed to his success.

Pecor participates in several CPOC committees, including the By-Law Committee, the Juvenile Services Committee, the CPOC Executive Committee, the Department of Juvenile Justice Parole Realignment Committee; in addition, he is the Regional Chair for CPOC's Sacramento Region.

Upon being informed of the award, the Placer County Board of Supervisors commended Pecor for his dedication and contributions to the CPOC organization, the Placer County criminal justice system, and the citizens of Placer County.

### ST. LAWRENCE COUNTY PROBATION DIRECTOR MOVES TO WESTCHESTER COUNTY, NEW YORK

St. Lawrence County Probation Director **Francine M. Perretta** left her post of 23 years on November 5, 2010, for a position as Deputy Commissioner of Westchester County's Probation Department.

Perretta, a member of the NAPE Board of Directors, worked in the St. Lawrence County Probation Department for 30 years and was a county employee for 33.

"Our loss is Westchester's gain," County Administrator **Karen M. St. Hilaire** said. "On a personal level, I hate to see her go, but on a professional level, it's a huge opportunity for her."

### NEW CHIEF IN PEORIA COUNTY, ILLINOIS

In January 2011 the Tenth Judicial Circuit announced that **Daniel Hunt** had accepted the position of Director of Probation and Court Services for Peoria County. As Director of Probation and Court Services, Hunt will report to the Court Administrator and oversee the divisions of adult probation, juvenile probation, and juvenile detention.

Prior to this appointment, Hunt served as the Chief Adult Probation Officer for Tazewell County Probation and Court Services. There, he had been responsible for the training and supervision of probation officers, development and implementation of specialized programs, and participated in the formulation of the department's annual budget, operations plan, and collective bargaining negotiations and contract administration.

Hunt is a certified trainer for the Administrative Office of the Illinois Courts (AOIC), responsible for training all new probation officers throughout the state. In addition, he is a representative

for the Tenth Judicial Circuit to the State's Probation Coordinating Council and serves on the council's leadership committee. He also serves on Central Illinois' Domestic Violence Multidisciplinary Team, working with a variety of professionals to increase the effectiveness of services provided to those impacted by domestic violence.

After completing undergraduate studies in accounting at Illinois State University, Hunt earned master degrees in educational leadership and human development from Bradley University, and a Master of Business Administration degree from the University of Illinois at Springfield. He is a licensed professional counselor in the State of Illinois.

A Peoria-area native, Hunt and his wife Ashley have two sons.

### NEW FEDERAL PROBATION CHIEF NAMED FOR DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

In January 2011 the Judges of the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts named **Christopher Maloney** as Chief U.S. Probation Officer; he fills the vacancy left by **John M. Bocon**, who retired.

Prior to this appointment, Maloney served for six years as Chief U.S. Probation Officer for the District of New Jersey. He also spent seven years working with the Administrative Office of the United States Courts in Washington, D.C., where he was responsible for oversight of the federal probation system's substance abuse, mental health, and location monitoring programs.

Maloney began his career as an inpatient substance abuse counselor for Odyssey Family Treatment Program in Medfield; became a probation officer in the Florida Department of Corrections; and then served as a federal probation officer from 1992 to 1997 in Boston.

He is a 1989 graduate of Fitchburg State College in Massachusetts. The Dedham native also did graduate studies at Suffolk University in Boston and Florida Atlantic University in Boca Raton.

### NEW HEAD OF PROBATION AND PAROLE IN SOUTH CAROLINA

**Kela E. Thomas**, an Orangeburg native, was appointed by South Carolina Governor **Nikki Haley** and confirmed by the South Carolina State Senate as Director of the South Carolina Department of Probation, Parole, and Pardon Services (PPP) on February 24, 2011.

Thomas, the first African American female to head the third largest law enforcement agency in the state, has been employed with the Department since 1999, where she served as Deputy Director for Administration. She was principal advisor to the Director on general agency administration, to include fiscal and materials management, budgeting, training compliance and professional development, and information technology systems.

She has had a diverse background in project management, budget and legislative issues, marketing and personnel development. Prior to assuming her duties as Deputy Director, Thomas served as the Director of Development for the School of Public Health at the University of South Carolina. She has had a lengthy career in financial management and executive oversight of program development, guidelines and processes.

Thomas holds a Bachelor of Arts degree in management and journalism from the University of South Carolina. She received

## Executive Exchange

---

a Diploma in Banking from the South Carolina Bankers School in 1990 and is a 2001 graduate of the South Carolina Executive Institute.

Her professional affiliations include membership in the South Carolina Law Enforcement Association, South Carolina Probation and Parole Association and the South Carolina State Employees Association.

### JUDGES NAME NEW CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER IN PORTER COUNTY, INDIANA

Twenty-nine years after being hired by the Porter County Adult Probation Department in Valparaiso, **Stephen Meyer** has been appointed Chief Probation Officer.

On February 28, 2011, the county's six judges named Meyer as the new chief probation officer to replace **Neil Hannon**, who left in November after 40 years of service. Meyer had been serving as interim chief following Hannon's departure and as Assistant Chief since 1989.

Meyer's assignments with the department have included development and supervision of the home detention program and development of the Project Pro sex offender treatment program. He has extensive experience in preparing presentence reports, according to Porter Circuit Court Judge **Mary Harper**.

Meyer is responsible for a staff of 30, including 24 probation officers. The office oversees 1,500 felony and 3,000 misdemeanor offenders on probation.

In commenting on Meyer's promotion, **Robert L. Bingham**, Chief Probation Officer in Indianapolis, Indiana, and a past President of NAPE, said: "Stephen is a good, good man. I am confident he will be successful in leading the department."

### NIJ DIRECTOR SHARES CRIME PRIZE WITH HARVARD PROFESSOR

It was announced in November the 2011 Stockholm Prize in Criminology has been jointly awarded to **John Laub**, Director of the National Institute of Justice (NIJ), and **Robert Sampson**, a Harvard social sciences professor, for their research showing why and how criminals stop offending. Laub and Sampson are authors of a long-running life-course study of criminal behavior. They discovered that even very active criminals can stop committing crimes for good after key "turning points" in their lives, including marriage, military service, and employment. Their influential work has been published in numerous articles and two books — *Crime in the Making* (1993) and *Shared Beginnings, Divergent Lives* (2003).

Laub and Sampson will receive the prize in June in Stockholm, Sweden. The international prize is awarded by the Swedish Ministry of Justice for outstanding achievements in crime research or for the application of research by practitioners for the reduction of crime and the advancement of human rights. Laub directs the NIJ, the research arm of the U.S. Department of Justice. He is on leave from the University of Maryland, where he is a Distinguished University Professor in Criminology and Criminal Justice. Sampson, former chairman of Harvard's Department of Sociology, is on leave to the Russell Sage Foundation in New York.

Laub has previously contributed to *Executive Exchange* about life-course criminal behavior.

### NEW PROBATION DIRECTOR IN ROCKLAND COUNTY, NEW YORK

On November 18, 2010, Rockland County Executive **C. Scott Vanderhoef** announced the appointment of **Kathleen Tower-Bernstein** as the County's new Director of Probation.

"I have every confidence that Kathi has the expertise and enthusiasm to fulfill the duties of the Director of Probation and oversee the department," said Vanderhoef. "I look forward to working with her in this new capacity."

For over 25 years, Tower-Bernstein has been employed by the County of Rockland in the Probation Department working her way up from a Probation Officer to Deputy Director of Probation. Tower-Bernstein has served as Acting Director of Probation since the retirement of former director **Jacqueline Stormes** in October 2009.

"I am honored to be appointed to the position of Director of Probation," said Tower-Bernstein. "As an integral part of the criminal justice system, the Probation Department is committed to promoting community safety by reducing recidivism. I am fortunate to have an experienced and skilled staff who are committed to holding offenders accountable, assisting victims of crime and upholding orders of the Courts. I look forward to continuing to work with them to enhance the quality of life in Rockland County."

### NEW LEADERSHIP IN WALKER COUNTY, TEXAS

Late last year the Judges overseeing the Judicial District Community Supervision and Corrections Department for Walker, Grimes, Madison, and Leon Counties, headquartered in Huntsville, Texas, appointed new leadership.

In September 2010 **Kristin Hunter** was named Interim Director of the department following the departure of **John McGuire**; on November 1, 2010, she was appointed to that position on a permanent basis. She is the first female to serve in this capacity.

Hunter began her association with the department as an intern in June 1993. Following successful completion of that program in August 1993, she was hired as a part-time Probation Officer Assistant while she continued her studies at Sam Houston State University. Following graduation in December 1993, she was promoted to Probation Officer and assigned to the Court Services Division. She has served as a Senior Officer and the department's Sex Offender Contact Person. On July 1, 2009, she was appointed to the Deputy Director's position.

In addition to the National Association of Probation Executives, Hunter is a member of the Texas Probation Association and the American Probation and Parole Association.

In September 2010, **Shelia Hugo** was named Interim Deputy Director and assumed that role on a permanent basis on December 1, 2010. She entered on duty with the department in June 1991 as an Assessment Technician. In February 1992, following the successful completion of the Adult Probation Officer Certification Examination, she was promoted to the position of Probation Officer.

Hugo is a graduate of Sam Houston State University with a Bachelor of Science degree in criminology and corrections. The majority of her time with the department has been spent in the Court Services Division. She has served as a Senior Officer and Supervisor.

In April 2010, Hugo was awarded the Judge Terry L. Jacks Award for Outstanding Line Officer by the Texas Probation As-

sociation. Hugo is a frequent speaker at the Huntsville Police Department's Citizen's Academy. She is a 1999 graduate of the Huntsville Leadership Institute. She has served as volunteer to the SAAFE House and Walker County Fair Association. She was named the department's Employee of the Year in 2004.

NAPE past President **Dan Richard Beto**, who hired both Hunter and Hugo as probation officers during the time he served as the department's Director, praised the judges for "selecting these two fine professionals to lead the department."

### THREE PROBATION CHIEFS NAMED IN GEORGIA

In March 2011 Georgia Corrections Commissioner **Brian Owens** announced three promotions to Chief Probation Officer.

**Cory Beggs** was promoted to Chief Probation Officer for the Conasauga Judicial Circuit effective March 16, 2011. Beggs will be responsible for the oversight of 33 staff members and the supervision of all felony probationers in the Conasauga Judicial Circuit.

"Cory is deserving of this opportunity to serve as Chief Probation Officer," said Commissioner Owens. "His job performance has been exceptional and I am confident in his ability to oversee the Conasauga Judicial Circuit."

Beggs began his career with the Department in 2003 as a Probation Officer in the Blairsville Probation Office and was promoted to Probation Officer III in 2006. Before joining the Department, Beggs worked with the Department of Family and Children Services and Appalachian Technical College. He earned a bachelor's degree in education from North Georgia College and is currently working on a master's degree at Columbus State University.

Owens also announced the promotion of **Georg Trexler** to Chief Probation Officer for the Eastern Judicial Circuit effective March 16, 2011. Trexler will be responsible for the oversight of 43 staff members and the supervision of all felony probationers in the Eastern Judicial Circuit.

"Georg has been dedicated to the Department's Probation Operations for 25 years," said Commissioner Owens. "His knowledge and experience will be valuable to the staff and probationers in his new circuit," added Owens.

Trexler began his career with the Department in 1986 as a Probation Officer I in the Brunswick Probation Office. He has also served as Office Manager in the Atlanta Judicial Circuit, Intensive Probation Supervision/Specialized Probation Supervision Officer for the Brunswick Judicial Circuit and Probation Officer III in the Jesup Probation Office. Trexler most recently served as Probation Officer III/Office Manager in the Brunswick Probation Office. He earned a bachelor's degree in public administration from Auburn University and has completed several GDC management courses. Trexler is also a sworn member of the U.S. Marshal Service Fugitive Task Force and an active member of the Southeast Probation Correctional Emergency Response Team.

And Commissioner Owens announced the promotion of **Vickie Lee** to Chief Probation Officer for the Macon Judicial Circuit, effective March 16, 2011. Lee will be responsible for the oversight of 52 staff members and the supervision of all felony probationers in the Macon Judicial Circuit.

"Vickie is a hard worker and has excelled at all job assignments," said Commissioner Owens. "I am confident her knowledge of the Macon Judicial Circuit will serve her well as Chief Probation Officer."

Lee began her career with the Department in 2001 as a Probation Officer in the Macon Probation Office and was promoted to Probation Officer III in 2005. She earned a bachelor's degree in psychology from Georgia College and State University.

The Georgia Department of Corrections is the fifth largest prison system in the United States and is responsible for supervising nearly 60,000 state prisoners and over 150,000 probationers. It is the largest law enforcement agency in the state with approximately 13,000 employees.

### NEW CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER IN ALAMEDA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

In December 2010 the Alameda County Board of Supervisors announced its appointment of **David Muhammad** as Alameda County Chief Probation Officer effective February 14, 2011.

"Mr. Muhammad is a leader in the fields of juvenile justice and violence prevention and in reforming the juvenile justice system," stated Board President **Alice Lai-Bitker**. **Susan S. Muranishi**, County Administrator added that "these are extremely challenging times for local government and David's commitment to partnerships and innovation is key to providing services to our at-risk youth and adults." Muhammad stated that "I am fully committed to serving our youth and to work collaboratively with the community and County staff to serve our residents and work with the stakeholders on the challenges facing the Probation Department."

Muhammad returned to Alameda County from New York City where he served as Deputy Commissioner of the City's Department of Probation - Adult Services, and was responsible for overseeing 35,000 offenders on probation with a staff of 800. Prior to his position in New York City, he served as the Chief of Committed Services for the Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services in Washington, D.C., where his responsibilities included the supervision of 300 staff, a \$42 million annual budget, and a juvenile institution with 900 youth in his department's care.

He was formerly the Executive Director of The Mentoring Center (TMC) in Oakland. Under his leadership, TMC doubled in staff size and tripled its budget as it became the premiere agency serving high at-risk youth. TMC's work has become renowned in all three of its service areas: direct service, technical assistance and training, and policy advocacy.

Muhammad received a bachelor's degree in journalism from the Howard University School of Communications in Washington, D.C.

In honor of his work with youth, he received the 2000 Community Leadership Award and Fellowship from the California Wellness Foundation, honoring community leaders who are involved in violence prevention. In 2002, he was awarded the prestigious Next Generation Leadership Award from the Rockefeller Foundation.

### NAPE BOARD MEMBER ELECTED TO BOARD OF TEXAS PROBATION ASSOCIATION

In April 2011, NAPE Board Member **Javed Syed**, Director of the Nueces County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Corpus Christi, Texas, was elected to the Board of Directors of the Texas Probation Association.

Syed, who earned a master's degree in criminal justice from Sam Houston State University, has devoted more than three de-

## Executive Exchange

cedes working in community corrections. He got his start as a probation officer with the Harris County Adult Probation Department in Houston; over the years he held positions of increasing responsibility, including unit supervisor, ISP supervisor, specialized caseload supervisor, facility director, and branch director. In January 2005 he assumed responsibility for the leadership of the Nueces County department.

In addition to serving on the NAPE Board of Directors, Syed is a member of the International Committee. He is also Co-chair of the Legislative Committee of the Texas Probation Association.

### NEW CHIEF NAMED IN PLACER COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

In April 2011 **Marshall Hopper**, a 14-year Placer County Probation Department employee, was named to replace **Stephen Pecor**, who retired after 29 years with the county, including the last five as Chief Probation Officer.

County Executive Officer **Tom Miller** selected Hopper for the Chief Probation Officer post after consulting with Placer County Superior Court Presiding Judge **Alan Pineschi**.

Hopper was hired by Placer County as a deputy probation officer in 1997 and appointed Assistant Chief Probation Officer last year. In his new job, Hopper will oversee a department responsible for supervising more than 4,000 offenders on probation in the county. The department also operates the county's Juvenile Detention Center in North Auburn, alternative sentencing programs, and jail food services. The department has an operating budget of more than \$24 million and employs 142.

Hopper started out as a group counselor in Shasta County in 1989 before moving to El Dorado County two years later. A Roseville resident, Hopper earned a bachelor's degree in criminal justice from California State University – Sacramento and a master's degree in public administration from Golden Gate University.

## NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES

### 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 \_\_\_\_\_

<b>CHECK</b>	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