

# National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

SPRING 2016

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

*"The very essence of leadership is you have a vision. It's got to be a vision you articulate clearly and forcefully on every occasion. You can't blow an uncertain trumpet."*

~ Theodore Hesburgh (1917-2015)



I was sitting in my home office on December 15, 2015, and was reflecting on the previous year's accomplishments, successes, and failures. I was trying to determine what impact I had on improving people's lives, creating safer communities, producing fewer victims, and reducing recidivism. Surely, I did a lot of things in 2015; however, what impact did I have on the above outcomes? Upon examination I discovered that my impact was not as large as I wanted it to be. If you or your organization did the same reflection what impact would you have had in 2015? Did you or your organization positively impact the above stated goals/objectives? In order to not have the same reflection on December 15, 2016, I made a cognitive decision to make 2016 the GREATEST YEAR EVER.

Some of us and our organizations are stuck. We have done good things in the past; however, we continue to do those same things without measuring and getting feedback from staff, offenders, and stakeholders to determine their effectiveness. Based on our failure to continually measure we slowly become the *status quo* and resistant to change. We are aware that in an evidence based world there will always be a measurement feedback loop that should make us consistently measure and evaluate to ensure effectiveness and alignment with the goals of safer communities, fewer victims, and a reduction of recidivism. Embracing the *status quo* or being resistant to change doesn't produce the outcomes that are needed, doesn't create a culture where staff can respectfully challenge a process, and doesn't foster creative ideas on how we can transform our business. We need to fight against aligning ourselves with the *status quo* and being resistant to change.

For 2016 to be the greatest year ever we are going to have to take some risk – "Risk Takers are Difference Makers." One of the biggest risks we need to take is how we can leverage technology to improve our business, while reducing workload/caseload. Other than mandated GPS, I personally have been opposed to this notion as I have been a firm believer that we need to build effective, ethical relationships with the population that we serve. These relationships are the cornerstone for our success and you can't build them if we don't see them.

This was a short-sighted mindset as I have discovered that technology can aid you in building relationships, reduce caseload/workload, and improve overall operations. Based on this, I am challenging all community corrections agencies to discover ways on how technology can be utilized to improve our business. This will be the sole focus of NAPE's Summer 2016 edition of *Executive Exchange*, therefore share your ideas.

Second, for 2016 to be the GREATEST YEAR EVER we need to continue to effectively communicate with staff. In most organizations communication continues to be one of the major problems. Therefore, this is something that we must always address and utilize different types of communication to ensure that the message is heard by everyone. We will NOT have the greatest year ever if leadership can't effectively communicate the shared vision, mission, goals, and objectives of the agency. We must also ensure that all staff members – regardless of rank or title – have a voice and that their voice is appreciated by the agency.

Thirdly, we must continue to celebrate our accomplishments, without resting on our achievements. Utilize *Executive Exchange* to share articles, ideas, achievements, millstones of your department so that they can be shared with our membership. Continue to nominate staff for local and national awards for the outstanding work that they do.

*Continued on page 2*

## CONTENTS

President's Message, <i>Marcus M. Hodges</i> . . . . .	1
Is Safety Taking a Back Seat to Everything Else?, <i>Ronald G. Schweer and Robert L. Thornton</i> . . . . .	2
The Hindsight Bias in Leadership, <i>Randy Garner, Ph.D.</i> . . . . .	4
Why Do I Need a Business Plan?, <i>George M. Keiser</i> . . . . .	6
The Case for PREA in Community Corrections, <i>Elisabeth Thornton</i> . . . . .	8
Indiana's Justice Reinvestment Journey: A Revamped Criminal Code, <i>Linda Brady</i> . . . . .	9
Job Fairs and School Sponsored Career Days Benefit Probation Departments, <i>Tobin Lefler</i> . . . . .	12
Virginia Embraces the Challenges of Evidence Based Decision Making, <i>Lester Wingrove</i> . . . . .	13
From the Bookshelf . . . . .	15
Briefly Noted . . . . .	19
News from the Field . . . . .	22

*Continued from page 1*

Immediately prior to the APPA Summer Institute in Cleveland, Ohio, on August 28-31, 2016, we will be presenting NAPE awards at our yearly reception. These awards are: *Sam Houston State University Probation Executive of the Year Award*, *Dan Richard Beto Award*, and *George M. Keiser Award for Exceptional Leadership*. More information about these awards can be found on our website [www.napehome.org](http://www.napehome.org).

Lastly, for 2016 to be the GREATEST YEAR EVER we need to continually re-commit to the commitment – that commitment we made to ourselves as to why we do this work. It is about transforming lives, one individual at a time. I thank all of you for what you do in creating safer

communities, fewer victims, and reducing recidivism. Collectively, we can make 2016 the GREATEST YEAR EVER for the agencies that we serve.

*Of those to whom much is given, much is required. And when at some future date the high court of history sits in judgment on each of us – recording whether in our brief span of service we fulfilled our responsibilities – our success or failure, in whatever office we hold, will be measured by the answers to four questions – were we truly people of courage...were we truly people of judgment...were we truly people of integrity...were we truly people of dedication?*

*~ John F. Kennedy (1917-1963)*

**Marcus M. Hodges**  
President

## IS SAFETY TAKING A BACK SEAT TO EVERYTHING ELSE?

by

**Ronald G. Schweer**  
and  
**Robert L. Thornton**

---

Each day in America the number of listserv messages, website postings, and media outlet notices expands as the number of surveys, studies, and research projects literally inundate professionals in the field of community corrections. The emphasis on evidence-based practices and data analysis bombards our senses as virtually everyone strives to make the right decisions and move forward with a “what works” mentality to address the issues of recidivism, community safety, and successful re-entry strategies for offenders. Rarely will you see the topic of staff safety at the forefront of any of the aforementioned communication sources. As a result, questions being brought forth by staff safety trainers and other professionals in probation, parole, and community corrections focus on whether or not safety is emphasized by agency administrators to a lesser extent now than in past years. Quite simply, is safety taking a back seat to everything else that officers are expected to accomplish on any given day? A brief review of data being generated in the media and other sources around the community corrections profession might help answer this question.

A national database for staff safety incidents has been a topic of the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA) Health and Safety Committee for more than a decade. Hazardous incidents and violent acts committed against traditional law enforcement officers and agencies are recorded by the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). Monthly and annual reports are generated by the FBI which provide specific details and data on officers killed and assaulted. Unfortunately, officers performing duties in the field of community corrections – including pretrial, probation, parole, and community corrections officers – are not tracked or recorded in the FBI reports. The *Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted* report provides a huge volume of information regarding assailant profiles, officer profiles, weapons used, officer responses, time of day, and a myriad of other

data elements which can assist law enforcement officers to prepare for the unexpected.

Currently, the field of community corrections relies on individual city, county, and state agency processes to compile hazardous incident data. Many of these jurisdictions do not have a method to compile the data, nor do they have a mechanism in place to allow staff to report incidents as they occur. The Federal Probation and Pretrial Services System is the exception in the area of hazardous incident reporting. The Safety Information and Reporting System (SIRS) was created by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, Probation and Pretrial Services Office (PPSO), to record hazardous duty incidents experienced by staff in the 94 judicial districts, which includes the 50 states and territories of the United States.

It's been over two decades since Philip J. Bigger, Vice President of the Federal Probation and Pretrial Officers Association (FPPOA), completed (1993) and published (1995) the results of the *National Study on Serious Assaults*. Prior to the study by Bigger there had been no nationwide research to determine the true extent of hazardous duty incidents experienced by staff. The study involved the completion of a survey distributed to all 50 states and territories of the United States, both juvenile and adult, for whom pretrial, probation, and parole officers were employed. The study included municipal, county, state, and federal systems. The survey requested data for calendar years 1980 through 1992 and the form used to collect the data included the following categories: Murder, Rape, Other Sexual Assault, Shot and Wounded, Use of Blunt Instrument, Slashed and Stabbed, Use of a Car as Weapon, Punched-Kicked-Choked-Other Use of Body, Use of Caustic Substance, Use of Incendiary Device, Abducted or Held Hostage, and Other (Unspecified) Assaults. Attempts to commit these acts were also included separately. In all, 955 agencies were contacted and 459 (48%) agencies respond-

ed. The results reflected there were 1,818 completed assaults for the categories contained on the survey form, plus 792 attempted acts, for a total of 2,610 incident reports. The conclusion of the study suggested the results “probably under-represent the actual number of assaults occurring” since a few states and territories, a large number of local jurisdictions, and some major metropolitan areas (e.g. City of New York, etc.) did not respond to the survey.

The PPSO has compiled data on hazardous incident reports filed by the 94 federal judicial districts since 1981. The first published statistics were for calendar years 1981 through 1983 and referenced the 114 incident reports filed during that 3-year period. Quarterly reporting of hazardous incidents commenced in 1984. Incident report statistics for calendar years 1984 through 1999 were published in the agency *News and Views* newsletters. The National Institute of Corrections financially supported the completion of a revised monograph, *Staff Safety: New Approaches to Staff Safety – Second Edition* (Thornton 2003) to update the previous publication (1993) on the topic of staff safety. It was in this revised monograph that federal hazardous duty incidents were reported for the years 1984-1999. In summary, 1,823 incident reports were filed by staff during the 16 year period. These incidents were spread across 40 incident categories, with a low of 40 reports (1985) and a high of 194 reports (1994) filed annually.

A report (unpublished) detailing the hazardous incident reports completed by federal probation and pretrial officers from January 1, 2000, to April 30, 2009, was completed in 2013 (Schweer, 2013). This report detailed the 1,164 hazardous incidents filed by staff in 91 of the 94 districts, and listed 26 incident categories. The report also provided additional information related to Day of Week, Time of Day, Location, and Initiator of Incident. On May 1, 2009, PPSO launched a new electronic database for the filing of all future hazardous incident reports. The Safety Information and Reporting System (SIRS) was initially developed to provide an electronic means to file reports, versus the hard copy reports mailed to PPSO prior to SIRS. Since May of 2009, the number of hazardous incidents has been reported annually in the *News and Views* newsletter. The report totals for calendar years 2009-2014 are 195, 369, 333, 386, 367 and 347, respectively. The SIRS reports are spread across 12 incident categories. The report format changed in 2015 from a calendar year report (January 1 – December 31) to a federal fiscal year (October 1 – September 30) report. The hazardous incident total for federal fiscal year 2015 (October 1, 2014 – September 30, 2015) was 477. The total number of reports filed between 2009 and 2015 is 2,474, with some overlap of reporting between October 1, 2014, and December 31, 2014, resulting from the change from calendar year to federal fiscal year reporting. Based on this data, the total number of hazardous incident reports filed by federal probation and pretrial services officers since 1981 is 5,575.

The National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial is centered in the 400 block of E Street, NW, in Washington, D.C., and is the nation’s monument to law enforcement officers who have died in the line of duty. Dedicated on October 15, 1991, the Memorial honors federal, state and local law enforcement officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice for the safety and protection of our nation and its people. Carved on the marble walls of the Memorial are the names of more than 20,000 officers who have been killed in the line of duty throughout the history of the United

States. Among these memorialized public servants are the names of 30 probation and parole officers who carried peace officer status in their jurisdictions and died in the performance of their assigned duties. In total, 48 probation and parole officers have been documented as being killed in the line of duty or under unusual circumstances. Of this number, 18 were not designated as peace officers in the agency of employment or the circumstances of their deaths presents a question of whether or not the fatality was work-related. The overwhelming majority (45) died in the United States, with the remaining three in Canada (2) and The Philippines (1). The defendant/offender was identified as the assailant in 13 of the 48 deaths, with an additional three officers killed by a third party assailant. Two of the total deaths remain under investigation and will continue to appear on the list of line-of-duty deaths until a conclusive determination is made regarding whether or not the officers’ deaths were work-related.

As previously noted, the FBI maintains an extensive database on law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. The *Officers Feloniously Killed* section of the *2014 Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted* report contains information regarding the status of the known assailant at the time of the incident. The status section of the report identifies six separate categories which provide specific background information on the assailants. The category of primary interest for this article is identified as “Under judicial supervision.” This category includes the sub-categories: Probation, Parole, Halfway House, Escapee from penal institution, and Conditional release, pending criminal prosecution. The report provides data on 10 consecutive years, 2005 – 2014. During this period of 10 years there were 563 known assailants that were identified as being responsible for the officers feloniously killed during this timeframe (FBI – LEOKA – 2014 – Table 49). The sub-categories pertinent to this article include those directly related to community release: Probation, Parole, and Conditional release, pending criminal prosecution. As noted, 563 officers were feloniously killed during the period of 2005 – 2014, and of this number there were 139 deaths attributed to assailants on probation, parole, or conditional release. In summary, 24.7% or approximately 1 in 4 law enforcement officers feloniously killed in the line of duty during this period of 10 years had their lives ended by an assailant that was subject to some form of probation, parole, or pretrial supervision at the time the act was committed.

The media is a perpetual source of information regarding the hazardous situations faced by probation, parole, pretrial, and community corrections officers on a daily basis. Since January 1 of this year there has been 12 serious incidents reported in the media that involved community corrections officers. These incidents and others should remind us all that we face situations of high risk on a daily basis, and not only during our work hours but at home as well. A recent incident was reported in the media that involved two offenders plotting to perform a home invasion of the assigned officer’s residence, including the binding, torturing, and sexual assault of the officer, before killing the officer. The scheme was discovered before the intended crimes were committed and both offenders are facing new charges. Further, reports often appear in the media daily which describe the plain view discovery of firearms, drugs, drug paraphernalia, active meth labs, stolen property, dangerous weapons, and potentially violent subjects while performing home contacts in the commu-

nity. In addition, many other reports detail the incidents which occur in the public and private building locations and offices occupied by community corrections staff. The bottom line is that officers must bring their A-game to work every day and be aware that the risks associated with the community corrections profession may literally extend beyond the walls of work and follow them home.

As our profession continues to stress the use of evidence-based practices in supervision and delivery of treatment services, shouldn't we apply the same standards to the safety training we *must* provide our officers? To effectively provide relevant training we first need to have statistical information on what threats officers are actually encountering. This should be done on both local and national levels. Training time and resources are too limited for us to provide training that is not relevant and realistic.

We should then take safety training from the classroom to realistic environments that expose officers and staff to the situations research indicates they are likely to encounter. Then, they must be provided performance-based feedback from true subject matter experts, stressing both what they did well and suggesting areas of improvement. Such training has been shown to both enhance the skills of officers, and in areas of judgment and use of force, reduce liability for both the agency and the officer.

The prevention of loss or serious injury of one officer, or avoidance of one finding of liability against an officer and/or agency, pays for years of safety training. Let's use the same standards of quality for officer training that we have set for delivery of offender services, while providing the tools officers need for their own protection and the protection of the community.

## References

- Federal Bureau of Investigation. *2014 Law Enforcement Officers Killed and Assaulted*, FBI Website, February 24, 2016.
- Schweer, Ronald G. *Hazardous Duty Incident History Report*, December 10, 2013.
- Thornton, Robert L. *Staff Safety: New Approaches to Staff Safety – Second Edition*, Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Corrections, 2003.

**Ronald G. Schweer**, M.P.A., served 38 years in the fields of law enforcement and community corrections before retiring in July 2015 from the position of Chief United States Probation Officer for the District of Kansas. He is now the Director of Management & Organizational Training for Community Corrections Institute, LLC, consulting on agency policy and training development for staff in the areas of safety and leadership.

**Robert L. (Bob) Thornton**, M.Ed., is Director of Community Corrections Institute, LLC, a company dedicated to providing training and consultation specifically designed for corrections and law enforcement agencies. Previously, he served as a Pretrial, Probation, and Supervising United States Probation Officer for over 27 years, during which he served as a faculty member of the Federal Judicial Center and has developed, and continues to provide training in, enhanced supervision, officer safety skills, dealing with aggressive behavior, effective communication skills, and management programs.

## THE HINDSIGHT BIAS IN LEADERSHIP

by

Randy Garner, Ph.D.

---

We are all subject to a number of psychological biases, heuristics, and cognitive influences when we work to make sense of the world around us and the people in it. As leaders, our judgments can impact many others and it behooves us to become as aware as possible of some of the biases we encounter. The authors of the very popular *The Leadership Challenge* (Kouzes & Posner) relate that the very best leaders are those who are attuned to what is going on inside themselves as they are leading as well as what's going on with others. In fact, they go on to say that learning more about ourselves – how we tick, how we interpret the actions of others – is critical to effective leadership. From their perspective, an understanding of the psychological and other influences that impact our judgments is essential if we are to be better leaders.

In order to understand others, we must first know ourselves. For many years I have taught a graduate class entitled "Psychol-

ogy in Leadership." This course has been evaluated by students as one of the best courses because of its practical application and they report that it is one of the most eye-opening experiences in the Master degree program in Leadership and Management. The foundation of this class is the study of social psychology. Simply put, this is a scientific approach that examines how people think about, influence, and relate to each other. As leaders, this is what we do every day.

One of the important biasing influences in social psychology is something called the "**Hindsight Bias**" or the "**I Knew it All Along Phenomena**." This is a psychological tendency to exaggerate one's ability to have foreseen how something turned out after learning the outcome. It is "Monday Morning Quarterbacking" at its finest. We seem to have a penchant for "knowing" how something will turn out or what the consequences for some action or decision will be – after the fact. For example,

political pundits in a very close election who have deemed it “too close to call” may offer a different perspective once all the votes are in. Now, with this biased insight, they may report having seen a growing trend toward the political candidate that won. As the Danish philosopher Kierkegaard related, “Life is lived forwards, but understood backwards.”

If two individuals in a relationship live apart for some extended period of time, the resultant outcome of the relationship will likely be “known” and explained based on the facts identified after that result is known. For example, if their attraction and relationship grows people will say “absence makes the heart grow fonder.” However, if the relationship does not survive the separation, the explanation will likely be something like “out of sight; out of mind.” In fact, a survey of various quotations often finds paradoxical views. Is it “He who hesitates is lost” or is it “Look before you leap.” Is it “The pen is mightier than the sword” or is it “Actions speak louder than words.” Most likely it will be the one that fits the outcome of the specific situation being described – after-the-fact. As leaders we must be aware of the potential misgivings of “common sense” explanations as they are fertile ground for the hindsight bias.

This phenomenon can adversely impact our judgments when, now knowing the outcome or consequence of some decision or action, we overestimate how others should have “known” that this outcome would have occurred. We say things like, “this was an obvious bad decision on your part” or “anyone should have known that this would have happened!” The reality is that people can make good or reasonable decisions and things can still go wrong. One can make a judgment that seems appropriate at the time – but events may still go south. Unfortunately, with the hindsight bias, we lose sight of the original conditions or circumstance under which the decision was made and focus on the resultant outcome. We often “blame” others (and ourselves) for these “poor decisions.” If an outcome seems (in hindsight) as if it should have been foreseeable, we are more likely to blame the decision-maker for their “obvious” bad choice.

The Hindsight Bias or I Knew It All Along Phenomena has roots in both our cognitive processing and in our culture of focusing on personal responsibility. We typically look to blame others for what, in retrospect, had a less-than-desirable outcome because “they should have known better” or “should have been able to see that this would happen.” Leaders can appear to be both judgmental and arrogant by focusing only on the outcome with little regard for the circumstances under which the original decision was made. Further, some leaders overestimate their own intellectual and leadership abilities via this bias. Some leaders may boast that they have a strong record of hiring only the best and the brightest employees, accrediting their keen insight in the selection process. However, this

is a very biased view in that they only see the result of those they did hire – not those they did not. In fact, those they rejected may have gone on to be even more successful than the individuals that were hired – something the leader does not consider. Walt Disney was once famously fired from a newspaper for “lacking imagination” and having “no original ideas.” Of course, I am sure that boss continued to report to others that he too had a keen insight on hiring only the most talented people.

Our role as a leader demands that we be more attuned to the cognitive influences that can impact or influence our judgments. The Hindsight Bias can make us overly confident about the accuracy of our judgments and predictions. As a result, we must be vigilant in recognizing conditions in which this phenomenon might occur and be constantly aware of this potentially biasing influence.

### References

- Garner, R. L. (2008). “Psychology for Police Leadership.” In J. Ruiz and D. Hummer (Eds.), *Handbook of Police Administration*. Boca Raton, Florida: CRC/Taylor & Francis.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (2007). *The Leadership Challenge (4th ed.)*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Myers, D. (2008). *Social Psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

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

# WHY DO I NEED A BUSINESS PLAN?

by

George M. Keiser

---

In our last article, we referred to your organization as a business. If you doubt that characterization consider the size of your annual operating budget, capital expenditures, work force and payroll. Compare your numbers with other public and private companies in your town or city. I suspect you will find your business is more significant than you had realized.

We promoted the idea that in approaching your funding cycle you need to view your funders as investors and the appropriation process from the perspective of an investment strategy. With this approach in mind we referenced the necessity for a business plan. In this article we delve into why a business plan is relevant and beneficial for a government agency.

During my years at the National Institute of Corrections, I participated in and imposed on others many planning initiatives. They generally began with updating Vision and Mission statements before moving through goals and objectives. Today we would spend our initial time being certain the organization, public or private, has clarity of the nature of the business they are in.

No, that doesn't mean Pre-Trial Release, Probation or Parole. Those are legal dispositions which generate "clientele" for your organization or the title attached to your agency; they do not define the nature of your business. Over the decades, community corrections agencies have been in the ill defined rehabilitation business, the enforcement business and more recently the behavior change business. All of these business strategies took place under the banner of Probation and Parole and were influenced by broader societal conditions.

It is critical to know the nature of our business because that should define the content, competence and cost required to produce outcomes relevant to our investors. To clarify the nature of our business, we need to start by defining those outcomes we intend to produce not the activities in which we have historically engaged.

If, for example, you have determined you are in the behavior change business, frequently referenced evidence based practice, there are many organizations making that same claim. Most of them operate outside the criminal justice system. As business leaders, we need to look for these organizations in the literature and in our local communities. For example they will include medical and behavioral health, juvenile and adult learning. We need to begin to understand the content, bodies of knowledge, which inform their business policies and practices and may inform ours. We need to ascertain how they measure their resulting productivity. We need to compare this content and its evidence of productivity with the bodies of knowledge on which we are relying. This is particularly true if those organizations seek funding from the same people who are our investors.

As an example, the research which served as the foundation for what became known as evidence based practice for community corrections came from the academic discipline of psychology. The National Institute of Corrections learned that the

most significant psychologically defined risk factors for future involvement in criminal behavior were also risk factors for the general population gaining and more importantly maintaining employment. For example, people educated as occupational therapists are also studying behavioral psychology as well as the sciences of intellectual learning and physical capabilities related to obtaining and maintaining employment. While this is only one example, we need to explore other businesses to determine whether their knowledge potentially can inform our policies, work force, business practices or the outcomes we claim as our bottom line.

Before we can deliver relevant bodies of knowledge to our clientele, we first have to insure our staff understands the content and have the competence to deliver it with the discipline the research identifies is required. All too frequently we bring new content to staff, provide training which is really an introduction to a body of knowledge and then expect them to implement it with fidelity. It is not uncommon for this new knowledge to run contrary to what long term staff may believe. Even if they want to embrace it, they may not know how to do so. The research on behavior change relates to people, not just individuals with a label of offender. The implementation research tells us that behavior change should be coached practice with observed skill development. That means for staff first and then for the clientele of your organization second.

All too frequently we believe we are too busy or lack the resources for this "coached implementation." That takes us to the third "c" – cost. We can read the literature on what works, understand the strategies to employ and even agree to the tactics and tools most likely to improve our performance, but if we haven't built a business plan that reflects the realistic cost and gained the buy in of our investors, we are doomed to underperform. All businesses, public or private, for profit or not for profit, have real costs to produce their products. Historically, community corrections has struggled in linking real cost to business practices proven to produce specific outcomes. If we want funders to act as investors, we have to be effective in defining outcomes and linking costs to their achievement. Presentation of this information has to be in a language understood by the investors.

So building a relevant business plan is dependent on investor buy-in to the product produced. If the funders don't understand and don't value the bottom line you propose to deliver through the business plan you have developed, you are operating on their benevolence rather than investment strategy (see the article, "When is a Gift not a Gift..."; *Executive Exchange*, Winter 2015). It is necessary for outcomes to have real value for the funders. You must link performance in achieving those outcomes to existing bodies of knowledge which, when effectively implemented, have proven results. When the investors give credence to the content having the potential to produce valued outcomes, they can then begin to understand a logical model that incorporates the numbers and type of staff required, coaching to improve re-

quired competence plus defined operational and capital costs that provide the context for obtaining the outcomes.

As you undertake the implementation of the business plan it is necessary to track key performance indicators and their prox-

ies to insure you are following a discipline which will actually produce the desired outcomes. Collection of key data allows for evaluation at a minimum and potentially research on your business performance.

**George M. Keiser** is the founder and CEO of Keiser and Associates. In a career that has spanned more than four decades, Mr. Keiser has served the criminal justice field in a variety of capacities. He began his career with the Iowa Department of Corrections in 1966 and held positions of corrections officer, counselor, psychiatric caseworker, and superintendent in institutions ranging from minimum to maximum security. He was Bureau Chief for both the Institution and Community branches of corrections in Iowa. During the last 28 years

of his public career, he served as the Community Corrections Chief for the National Institute of Corrections (NIC), where he was responsible for advancing the implementation of research supported practices in public and private, federal, state, and local corrections agencies throughout the United States. Much of the work promoted by Mr. Keiser has focused on bringing the key decision makers within the criminal justice system together in order to understand the impact, intended and unintended, they have on each other.

## INFORMATION ABOUT EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

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

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

Submissions for publication consideration should be formatted for letter size paper, double-spaced, with at least one inch margins. Persons submitting articles, commentaries, or book reviews should enclose a brief biographical sketch or resume and a photograph for possible inclusion. Submissions may be sent electronically to [probation.executives@gmail.com](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.

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

## THE CASE FOR PREA IN COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

by

Elisabeth Thornton

---

The Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA) is entering the third year of its initial three year audit cycle. Most state correctional systems have moved past their initial hesitation, delaying tactics and grumbling and realized that compliance is not only less difficult than initially perceived but also good for offenders, staff and a solid foundational principle for contemporary correctional practices and modern operations.

For Community Corrections, PREA compliance has been limited generally to the scope of standard §115.5 General Definitions:

...community treatment center, halfway house, re-titution center, mental health facility, alcohol or drug rehabilitation center, or other community correctional facility (including residential re-entry centers), other than a juvenile facility, in which individuals reside as part of a term of imprisonment or as a condition of pre-trial release or post-release supervision, while participating in gainful employment, employment search efforts, community service, vocational training, treatment, educational programs, or similar facility-approved programs during nonresidential hours.

However, it is time to explore and implement a broader perspective of PREA relative to Community Corrections and our Probation and Parole (P&P) Offices.

On its surface, PREA does not have specific applicability to probation and parole, however, compliance with the spirit and intent of the Act requires a system-wide approach that includes all corrections areas; confinement and supervision in the community. To ensure we don't render the tenets of PREA obsolete on release and dilute the protective value added for those sentenced to supervision, some continuity of standards should exist. Probation and parole will not have to enforce exhaustive standards or endure audits of offices, but a comprehensive approach to training on PREA, similar zero tolerance standards for P&P Officers, commonsense reporting practices and an eradication of sexualized environments should be a minimum.

P&P Officers should all receive initial and on-going PREA training and understand the system and requirements of reporting and detecting sexual abuse, assault and harassment. Of course, this should be partnered with annual training on fraternization and appropriate relationships and boundaries with those under supervision. In a blended Department of Corrections<sup>1</sup> (DOC), this should be exceedingly easy; intentional exclusion of a segment of employees in training, reporting and detecting sexual abuse, assault and harassment would be much more difficult. In non-blended systems, training should parrot that received by the Corrections staff, but include contact information for reporting allegations of those offenders just released from Corrections.

Sexual misconduct by law enforcement officers – at any level – jeopardizes public safety and generates environments of victimization that corrupt current efforts by the criminal justice

system to reduce recidivism. Employees of government agencies that utilize their position to victimize the vulnerable and disenfranchised compromise their personal integrity, jeopardize the safety of their peers and themselves, and erode public trust in their agency and their profession.

Sexual harassment, assault, and abuse are not confined to prisons or residential programs and occur as often in the world of probation and parole and in some instances may occur more often. Some states have neglected to include P&P Officers in carnal knowledge statutes to the detriment of the profession and resultantly there is little save organizational policy and orientation admonishments that reminds everyone that abuse of power in this manner is prohibited and exceedingly unethical. Including PREA training in the mix with a focus on the role of P&P in reduction of victimization allows P&P to reduce liability for their agencies and may force a consciousness regarding professional boundaries that reduces illegal and unethical behaviors.

Probation and parole wields significant discretion and latitude in the supervision of offenders, much of which occurs in the personal environments and arenas of the offenders' life versus in the environments (confines) of the agency. Similarly, administrative supervision is not always direct for field work and case load volume per Officer may further impact quality and consistency of supervision. P&P Officers are often seen as the pivotal person who determines a probationer's return to prison or ability to stay in the community; this makes probationers less likely to report abuse of power situations and may force concessionary and coping behaviors from them in the manner of trading sex for freedom. The ability to revoke an offenders' freedom can be based on the subjective assessment of compliance with each condition of supervision. The threat of revocation makes the authority of P&P Officers in the community weightier than that for Officers in custodial settings, resultantly; this discretion can easily be abused.

P&P Officers have access to information that includes potential for victimization including history of prior victimization, mental health issues and criminal records as well as current vulnerabilities such as employment, housing, substance abuse. This information allows P&P Officers to build community treatment paths, determine supervision level, and target specific services that are more likely to result in success for each person on their respective caseloads. However, this same information characterizes weaknesses of individuals that can be easily exploited by sexual predators posing as P&P Officers.

None of this is new, but PREA provides an opportunity to dust off these considerations and recommendations in P&P Offices across the country. As early as 2002, the National Institute of Corrections and Washington College of Law<sup>2</sup> were taking on sexual abuse, assault and harassment in P&P. They were addressing nationwide training programs that included even broad suggestions for orientation of offenders and their families regarding acceptable and unacceptable P&P Officer



behavior and the provision of multiple reporting mechanisms for concerns.

The P&P Office is also a safe haven for those who may have experienced abuse in a prison or confinement environment and providing a reporting mechanism that is anonymous for the reporter is supportive and non-threatening. All states should provide notice of a method of reporting sexual abuse and sexual assault to their probationers and parolees that does not include going through a chain of command. A simple notification of a toll-free number that ties into either a state-wide reporting line or a broader PREA reporting line ensures that those afraid to report have a voice and unethical Officers throughout the corrections system are rooted out. Even the inclusion of the Chief's or Deputy Chief's number to express concerns regarding supervision or conditions of supervision would be supportive. I would caution against an administrative grievance method as the sole source of reporting since it perpetuates abuse of power and victimization cycles and forces a culture of silence and non-reporting.

Prisons and confinement settings are addressing sexualized environments by PREA force and are actively engaged in eliminating these environments and the behaviors that contribute to them. P&P Offices are not forced to address these environments, by federal mandate, but should take this opportunity to ensure that sexual jokes, demeaning and harassing behaviors and staff fraternization are not familiar office behaviors. When staff behave unprofessionally in the office, engage in relationships and experience and perpetuate sexually harassing behavior it is more likely to result in the abuse of those who are under supervision.

Corrections has a primary obligation to protect those under their custody and supervision. This includes ensuring an environment with a zero tolerance for sexual abuse and sexual assault, proper training and proper supervision that protects those

already vulnerable from further victimization at the hands of public officials. Obligations to ensure public safety through the reduction of recidivism requires correctional systems to address past trauma of returning citizens and provide a safe haven for them to establish their lives as productive citizens.

Sexual misconduct in Probation and Parole is not a new focus and contemporary corrections practice include intensive training and often psychological testing designed to screen out those who may be apt to abuse their power or victimize others through the authority of their office. PREA is on its surface a requirement of custodial entities however to meet the spirit and intent of the Act and fully comply with the standards all correctional staff in any role have to be engaged and involved in creating zero tolerance. The logical extension of the comprehensive Act requires P&P staff to have full knowledge of how to address and report anything that may be relayed. Anything less than a system-wide approach is difficult to explain and misses the mark.

### Endnotes

1. Blended as used in this section includes DOCs that have responsibility for both institutions and community corrections.
2. Sourced through Center for Innovative Public Policies, Inc., during development of a National Institute of Corrections (NIC) funded project [Cooperative Agreements 01P18GIR4, 01P18GIR4, Supplement #1, 01P18GIR4, Supplement #2], November 2002.

**Elisabeth Thornton** is the Corrections Operations Administrator for the Virginia Department of Corrections in Richmond, Virginia.

## INDIANA'S JUSTICE REINVESTMENT JOURNEY: A REVAMPED CRIMINAL CODE

by

Linda Brady

Indiana's criminal code was last overhauled in the 1970s. In 2009, the Indiana General Assembly created a bipartisan commission for the broad purpose of evaluating the criminal code. The commission included representatives from all three branches of state government as well as prosecuting attorneys, public defenders, and other state-level correctional leaders.

The commission, known as the "Criminal Code Evaluation Commission" (CCEC), examined Indiana's criminal laws to evaluate the basic principles of:

- 1) Consistency;
- 2) Proportionality of penalties;
- 3) Like sentences for like crimes;

- 4) Elimination of duplication;
- 5) Increased certainty regarding the length of sentence to be served; and
- 6) Sentencing scheme designed to keep dangerous offenders in prison but avoid using scarce state prison space for nonviolent offenders.

The CCEC met during the summers of 2010, 2011, and 2012.

During the same time period the CCEC was meeting, a state-level ad hoc task force was created, known as the "Justice Reinvestment Project." This task force included representation from all three branches of government, and aided by the Council of State Governments and the Pew Foundation, a project

## Executive Exchange

---

partially sponsored by the U. S. Department of Justice. Indiana's Justice Reinvestment Project proposed to make certain targeted changes to Indiana law with the purpose of enhancing public safety by managing lower-level offenders in the community, freeing up prison space for more dangerous offenders, and re-investing the savings from the project in the communities to fund improved probation practices for lower-level offenders. The recommendations stemming from this task force were presented to the CCEC.

In December of 2010, the CCEC adopted the recommendations of the Indiana Justice Reinvestment Project, however, no legislation was passed in 2011 establishing the recommended changes. There was opposition to proposed legislation in the 2011 session of the Indiana General Assembly, in part based on the fact that the comprehensive review of Indiana's Criminal Code by the CCEC had not yet been completed. To move this project forward, the CCEC formed a "work group" with additional outside support from attorneys, state judicial and executive branch agencies, and the Office of the Indiana Attorney General. Some limited legislation was passed in 2012 that reflected certain recommendations of the Justice Reinvestment Project and by July of 2012, the CCEC filed its final report (Criminal Code Evaluation Commission: Review of Criminal Code).

Based on the recommendations of the CCEC, which included recommendations of the Justice Reinvestment Project, the Indiana General Assembly adopted legislation in 2013, 2014, and 2015 that updated Indiana's criminal code pursuant to the six principles established by the CCEC.

House Enrolled Act (HEA) 1006 of 2013 was the broad wholesale overhaul of the Indiana criminal code. The new criminal code moved four felony classes (A,B,C,D) to six felony levels (Level 1, signifying the most serious crimes, through Level 6, the least serious). The new code was designed to give judges more discretion in sentencing, to both make penalties more proportional and to strengthen penalties for the most serious crimes. The new code was to go into effect on July 1, 2014, to give the criminal justice system entities time to prepare for the changes. However, although this was a budget year, there were no specific budget appropriations to move Indiana forward with "justice reinvestment."

The criminal code was further modified in 2014 when the General Assembly changed the laws to require felony levels 1-5 to serve a minimum of 75% of the sentence, and Level 6 felons and misdemeanants to serve a minimum of 50% of the sentence. Some labeled this change "truth in sentencing," however, the credit time and goodtime credit calculations caused confusion.

The year 2015 marked a significant change. The General Assembly again modified the criminal code with substantive changes and concurrent budgetary appropriations. Credit time and goodtime credit levels were changed and clarified, with the most serious offenses such as sex offenses against children receiving the least amount of goodtime credit (serve six days to earn one day goodtime credit). One of the most significant changes made was to remove the lowest felony level from eligibility to serve sentences in prison. Effective January 1, 2016, Level 6 felons are no longer eligible to be committed to the Department of Correction with a few exceptions [Note: a Lev-

el 6 felony is the lowest level of felony in Indiana, carrying a penalty upon conviction of a fixed term between six (6) months and two and one half (2 1/2) years in prison and a fine of up to \$10,000]. This portion of the statute revision was designed to keep low-level offenders in local communities where they will have better access to mental health and substance abuse treatment as well as rehabilitative programming.

To help Indiana counties prepare for the increase in Level 6 felony offenders that will remain in local communities, the General Assembly appropriated \$55 million in new monies to fund grant programs over the next two years. The grant funding is divided between the Department of Correction's (DOC) community corrections grant program and the Family and Social Services Administration, Division of Mental Health and Addiction (DMHA). The DOC received \$5 million for State Fiscal Year (SFY) 2016 and \$20 million for SFY 2017, which is available for evidence-based and technology-based programs for moderate and high-risk felony offenders on community supervision with probation and/or community corrections [Note: In Indiana, probation is a judicial branch agency operated and funded by local courts at the county level, community corrections programs are operated at the county level by statutorily-defined advisory boards and parole is operated by the DOC]. The DMHA received \$10 million in SFY 2016 and \$20 million in SFY 2017, which is available for evidence-based mental health and addictions treatment as well as wrap-around services for persons currently charged with a felony offense or currently charged with a misdemeanor offense but with a previous felony conviction.

The General Assembly expected that the new criminal code would reduce DOC's costs; therefore, the new law provides that up to \$11 million in DOC cost savings per year, which may be reinvested in community corrections grants. Community corrections programs, probation departments, court recidivism reduction programs (such as problem solving courts), and prosecutor diversion programs, through a collaborative effort, are eligible to apply for the DOC community corrections grant funds.

The DMHA developed a voucher system, known as "Recovery Works," to distribute its grant funding to designated forensic treatment providers. The vouchers will reimburse mental health and addictions treatment providers for services provided to qualified offenders.

Indiana's new law also created a new statewide council, the Justice Reinvestment Advisory Council (JRAC). The council is charged with conducting state level reviews and evaluations of local corrections programs, advising the DOC and DMHA on grant awards, reviewing programming and interventions funded by grant awards, and suggesting areas/programs for future grants. The law specifies the membership of the nine-member council which consists of leadership from the executive and judicial branches of state and local government and includes as voting members the president of the Probation Officers Professional Association of Indiana (POPAI) and the president of the Indiana Association of Community Corrections Act Counties (IACCAC). Inclusion of probation and community corrections leadership is significant as it allows actual community supervision practitioners to have a voice at the table. The goal of the JRAC is to develop incarceration alternatives and recidivism

reduction programs at the county and community level. This council was designed to serve as the ongoing accountability piece for the justice reinvestment project. Agencies that receive DOC or DMHA funding will be required to report recidivism rates of participants and overall success rates of programs. In addition, DOC, DMHA and the Advisory Council will oversee funded programs to ensure adherence to evidence-based practices, collaboration with criminal justice partners and avoidance of service duplication.

The JRAC published its first annual report on October 1, 2015. A great deal of work lies ahead for the State of Indiana as we implement “justice reinvestment.” With the new Indiana code, the significant financial investment of the General Assembly, and the infrastructure of the JRAC to provide leadership and accountability, the pieces are in place to implement long-term change in the criminal justice system.

Additional information on the JRAC and the DOC and DMHA funding opportunities is available on the [Indiana Judicial Center website](#) at [Justice Reinvestment Advisory Council](#).

## References

Indiana Criminal Code Evaluation Commission. [Criminal Code Evaluation Commission Review of Criminal Code](#), 2012.

[Justice Reinvestment Advisory Council Annual Report, October 1 2015](#).

[\\$55M Grant Program Working to Keep Low-level Criminals Out of Prison](#), *Indiana Court Times*, Nov/Dec 2015.

**Linda Brady** is Chief Probation Officer for the Monroe Circuit Court Probation Department in Bloomington, Monroe County, Indiana. She also serves on the NAPE Board of Directors as the Central Region Representative.

For additional information on this topic, feel free to contact the author at (812) 349-2648 or at [lbrady@co.monroe.in.us](mailto:lbrady@co.monroe.in.us).

# NAPE

Make plans to attend the Annual Membership Reception of the National Association of Probation Executives on Saturday, August 27, 2016, in Cleveland, Ohio. This NAPE event will take place immediately prior to the commencement of the 41st Annual Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association.

To learn more about this year’s APPA Annual Institute and hotel accommodations, visit the APPA website at: <http://www.appa-net.org/eweb/>.

Additional information will be forthcoming about the always popular NAPE Reception.

## JOB FAIRS AND SCHOOL SPONSORED CAREER DAYS BENEFIT PROBATION DEPARTMENTS

by

Tobin Lefler

Most universities and schools host job fairs and/or career days on a regular basis. These events can prove to be very beneficial for participating probation departments. There are several advantageous reasons why departments should consider participating.

For openers, every probation department desires to recruit the best candidates for future open positions. In the past, other Chiefs have told me of their frustrations relating to finding qualified applicants to fill jobs in their respective departments. Job fairs give departments an opportunity to reach out to a very large number of potential employees in a very short amount of time. Most events last a few hours and rarely exceed one day. Years ago, career day events would only cater to folks already old enough to obtain employment. Nowadays, these events are being held for elementary students all the way up to college graduates. As we all know, the community corrections field is not for everybody. These events allow attendees to learn about community corrections to decide whether or not it is something they would be interested in pursuing.



Probation Officers Crystal Garza and Maria Castro working a table at a Career Day event hosted by a local School.

In addition to being a worthy recruiting tool, job fairs can be utilized to promote a positive image of your department in your community. Probation departments rarely receive media attention and when they do, it's usually for a negative reason. Career events can educate citizens and job seekers about how awesome our field really is. We are all very fortunate to be in the business of changing behavior for the better while helping make our communities safer places to live. I have sent officers to dozens of these events in the past several years and I have received nothing but positive feedback for doing so.

Another accolade from these events is increased moral. Many probation officers enjoy attending these events to show others how rewarding this line of work can be. It is nice for staff

to occasionally take a break from their everyday routine in order to present at a career day event. Most staff also see it as an honor to represent the department at a job fair. This is an excellent method to build an officer's confidence.

Becoming involved in job fairs and career day events is very simple and inexpensive. The first step you want to take is to reach out to schools, universities, and workforce agencies within your



Probation Officers Janette Garcia and Victoria Manajarrez performing breathalyzer demonstrations for job fair participants.

community to establish contacts. Let these folks know that your department would be interested in participating in any future job fairs or career day events. Create brochures that give a brief explanation of your department and the benefits of working at such a great place. You may also want to order a table apron with the department's name and logo affixed to it. Take several props such as breathalyzer machines, impaired vision goggles, onsite UA kits, etc. If the job fair is geared towards college graduates or older students, take job applications to hand out. It is also nice to take a bowl of candy and/or small free items (pencils, pens, etc.) for people visiting your booth. There is no right or wrong way set up your area. You will be surprised at the creativity you will see in your staff when they attend one of these functions.

As you can see, there are many advantages for your department to participate in one of these events. Whether you use these opportunities to enhance recruitment, strengthen your agency's image, or motivate staff; it will prove to be a win-win situation while costing little or nothing financially. I know there are many departments and agencies already seizing these opportunities. I encourage you continue to do so. However, there are also many departments and agencies that are not participating in job fairs and career days. If you are a part of this group, I challenge you to start by attending just one of these events. You'll be glad you did! You never know, you might just find a future leader out there who will do great things for our field.

**Tobin Lefler** is Director of the Cameron and Willacy Counties Adult Probation Department, headquartered in Brownsville, Texas. He is also on the NAPE Board of Directors representing the Southern Region.

## VIRGINIA EMBRACES THE CHALLENGES OF EVIDENCE BASED DECISION MAKING

by

Lester Wingrove

In 2008 the National Institute of Corrections (NIC) began the initial work on the framework of Evidence Based Decision Making (EBDM). The goal was to create guidance for justice systems that would result in improved system outcomes through collaborative partnerships, the systematic use of research, and a shared vision of desired outcomes. This framework provided a concrete method to bring partners together in a collaborative manner, encourage consensus around what the community hopes to achieve, and provide a framework for incorporating research into criminal justice decisions.

In 2010, through a competitive process, NIC selected seven local jurisdictions from six different states to receive technical assistance in an effort to test this promising concept and hopefully make criminal justice system improvements. Virginia was fortunate to have the jurisdiction of Charlottesville/Albemarle chosen as one of the initial sites. In this locality there existed the strong collaborative relationship between the Department of Corrections Probation Chief that provided felony supervision and the Administrator of the Local Probation Department which provided misdemeanor supervision. Through this long lasting and trusted relationship the foundation for system collaboration was formed. Both of these officials, Wendy Goodman and Pat Smith, were considered very credible by all of the local system stakeholders and they were persistent in creating an environment where local decision makers were willing to examine practices within their agencies and make changes that would lead to improved outcomes for the locality.

Over the next several years as this locality moved through the planning phase on to the implementation phase, positive changes began happen. The technical assistance provided by The Carey Group, The Center for Effective Public Policy, and others, created the awareness that it was necessary to challenge those practices that could be improved and to use data and research to inform the decisions around existing practices. Through the hard work of this locality the following change items were identified through the planning process and implementation is ongoing:

- Pretrial release decisions informed by an assessment instrument and staff are trained in service delivery.
- A Justice Reinvestment Initiative Grant was received to reduce reliance on jail without having an increase in crime and the proposed development of a Center for Risk Reduction, (CORR).
- The development of a web based Administrative Response to Violation Matrix that has significantly reduced technical violations and the number of probationers incarcerated at the regional jail.
- The evaluation of Domestic/Intimate Partner Violence to include the reworking of policies to maximize resources.

- A business case plan to conduct an analysis of court functioning to enhance the streamlining of court services.
- The development of a Data Integration prototype to enable multiagency communication with local legacy systems.

As other localities in Virginia watched and greatly appreciated the progress of Charlottesville/Albemarle, they were not able to replicate their work as there was no available technical assistance. To the excitement of Virginia localities, in 2014 NIC proposed the expansion of EBDM to the existing six states with the understanding that in this new planning phase the state would have to develop a State Policy Team to support change items identified in the local sites and have the organizational authority to reduce barriers that may impede the work of localities. In order to receive the technical assistance for these valuable services Virginia would have to submit an application and compete with the other states that had EBDM localities. NIC proposed to provide technical assistance for two states which would include six local sites and the State Policy Team.

In the spring of 2014 the Virginia Secretary of Public Safety and Homeland Security embraced the opportunity to expand EBDM sites and to engage high level state personnel to participate on the State Planning Team. Within several months of receiving this news from NIC, Virginia held an EBDM Summit to provide information to our localities about this opportunity and to answer questions. The Summit was a tremendous success with more than 250 in attendance. The work to prepare this event was a collaborative initiative by the Department of Corrections and the Department of Criminal Justice Services. The technical assistance providers, NIC staff, team members from other EBDM States and the Charlottesville/Albemarle Team made compelling presentations that created excitement throughout Virginia.

In the fall of 2014 following a competitive application process, Virginia was chosen to participate in EBDM expansion along with Wisconsin and Indiana. NIC decided to expand the states to participate in Phase V to three and to reduce the level of technical assistance to have the necessary funding for this initiative.

Virginia had a number of very competitive localities interested in participating in the EBDM process and after a very thorough review the following local sites were chosen:

1. City of Norfolk
2. City of Richmond
3. Chesterfield County/City of Colonial Heights
4. City of Petersburg
5. Prince William, Manassas and Manassas Park
6. Staunton, Augusta and Waynesboro

## Executive Exchange

---

Each local site has a Local Policy Team that includes judges, prosecutors, defense bar, police, sheriff, jail administrators, victims groups, treatment personnel, city/county government, pretrial services, local corrections and others. The goal is to have the individuals in the room who have the authority to make decisions about the local criminal justice system.

In addition to the six local teams, Virginia has a State Policy Team that includes high level personnel who represent each of the decision points in the state system. The goal of this team is to have the responsible individual at the table that can make decisions about the state wide system.

The local sites and the State Policy Team quickly learned that the collaborative work necessary to change systems is extremely challenging, even when strong relationships exist. It became apparent that when stakeholders within a system spoke regularly, they rarely spoke about processes and decisions within their systems. These conversations do not naturally occur without building a shared understanding and willingness to look at oneself. Obviously, trust among team members is essential.

The roadmap developed by NIC and the expert technical assistance was essential for the development of sound and productive teams. Each local team and the State Policy Team began the process by developing shared vision, a purpose for meeting, a charter, group rules and an understanding of collaboration. Although some of the group processes necessary to understand a common purpose are not always warmly received by some team members, they are necessary to form a true collaborative team.

The next step in the roadmap required each of our teams to map our systems and to identify each of the process and decision points within the system. This was very cumbersome and exhausting work but each team was able to identify points in the system where obvious gaps existed. Without this process, it is unlikely that our system would have been revealed with clarity. Once gaps were identified, baseline data, where available, was gathered to provide more detail around the scope of the perceived gap.

The system mapping work enabled each of the local teams and the State Policy Team to identify many potential action items that needed to be addressed. Most teams identified twenty to thirty potential action items. Some of the gaps were small and local team members were able to address them with a quick change in policy and practice. Most of the others were large in magnitude so each team had to develop agreed upon criteria and make the tough decision to choose three or four items to work on. Although many team members wanted to choose a large number of items to address, we recognized that the goal was to develop strategic action plans to implement these change targets and we had to be realistic.

Once the items were selected each team created subcommittees that included outside subject matter specialists, to gather data and to develop plans for implementation.

Virginia is now almost a year into our EBDM work and all teams are deeply immersed in our selected change items. The work of our teams has exceeded all of our expectations and we are quite certain that significant changes will be made in the criminal justice system in Virginia. Like the Charlottesville/Albemarle team that preceded us, each of our seven teams has a clear understanding of their system and a shared vision for change.

Some of the change items of our local teams are:

- The financial Impact of Fines and Costs
- Pretrial diversion for low risk offenders
- Improving responses to mental health defendants
- Improving responses to domestic violence victims
- A review of the use of assessment tools at each decision point
- Probation violation responses
- Educating the public and other criminal justice partners on EBDM
- Assessing inmates in local jails and providing sound re-entry services
- Program fidelity
- Data sharing

The State Policy Team has chosen the following change items:

- A review of validated risk assessments at each decision point in our system
- Data and information sharing
- Responses to probation violations

Virginia fully intends to pursue additional assistance from NIC as we move towards the implementation phase of this process. We have assembled very strong teams who have a deep understanding of collaboration, shared vision and a desire to improve systems by using data and evidence based knowledge to make informed decisions. The work ahead of us is very challenging and will not come easy; however the potential rewards of improving our system are enormous.

**Lester Wingrove** is Co-Coordinator of the State EBDM Policy Team for the Virginia Department of Corrections, in Richmond, Virginia.

## FROM THE BOOKSHELF

*Executive Exchange* welcomes reviews of books and periodicals dealing with community corrections, the criminal justice system, research and evaluations of correctional programs, and management and leadership issues. The reviews found in this issue have been contributed by: Dan Richard Beto, a former Chief Probation Officer in two Texas jurisdictions, a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives, and the founding Executive Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas; and Donald G. Evans, a Senior Fellow with the Canadian Training Institute, a Contributing Editor for *Executive Exchange*, and a former President of the American Probation and Parole Association and the International Community Corrections Association.

### A PRIMER FOR REFORMING THE BUREAUCRACY

*Review of A Passion for Leadership: Lessons on Change and Reform from Fifty Years of Public Service*, by Robert M. Gates. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2016. Pp. 240, \$27.95 (hardcover).

Drawing on his experiences in the service of his country – as Deputy Director of Central Intelligence under Presidents Ronald Reagan and George H. W. Bush, Deputy National Security Advisor and Director of Central Intelligence under President George H. W. Bush, President of Texas A&M University, and Secretary of Defense under Presidents George W. Bush and Barack Obama – in *A Passion for Leadership: Lessons on Change and Reform from Fifty Years of Public Service* Robert M. Gates provides fascinating insights in how one might successfully lead vast organizations that are resistant to change.

In the first chapter, the author – who earned a bachelor's degree in history from the College of William and Mary, a master's degree in history from Indiana University, and a doctorate in Russian and Soviet history from Georgetown University – lays out the purpose of this book:

I hope that this book will be of value to young people who aspire to become leaders: first by demonstrating to them that public service organizations can be worthy of their talents; second, should they choose that path, by offering them, early in their careers, some of the tools and personal attributes for leading change that they can begin to develop and strengthen. After all, today's new recruits will be tomorrow's senior leaders.

John Adams, our second president, wrote to his son Thomas, "Public business my son, must always be done by somebody – it will be done by somebody or other – If wise men decline it others will not: if honest men refuse it, others will not." My fervent hope is that this book will encourage the wise and honest among us, especially young people, to consider serving our fellow Americans – with confidence that public institutions can be reformed and shaped to success.

This book, which is an exceptionally easy read, is full of wise insights. In the second chapter – "Where You Want to Go: The Vision Thing" – Dr. Gates stresses the importance of new leaders of organizations possessing a clear and easily understood vision and a willingness to ask questions and listen. The third chapter deals with formulating a strategy, and the author writes: "For successful change at every kind of institution in both the private and the public sectors, a leader must win the support of

those in the trenches who deliver the mission of the organization. Recognition of their critical role and respect for them go a long way." He also acknowledges the importance of developing strong external constituencies – which also requires listening – that are supportive of the leader's vision.

In Chapter 4 – a particularly informative chapter – Dr. Gates provides techniques and actual examples for implementing change in the organization; particularly useful are task forces and similar ad hoc groups. Suggestions found in this chapter include:

The best way to get access to, and use, internal talent and ideas for specific steps to implement reform is to get people from different parts of the organization working together outside their normal bureaucratic environment.

A leader bent on transformational reform will benefit greatly from demanding – and demonstrating – transparency and sharing information about implementation, both internally and externally.

Be wary of consensus. When it comes to implementing reform, you must look very closely at any recommendation for action characterized as the consensus of a group. Does it advance your agenda? Is it as bold as you want or need?

A leader implementing reform, within the confines of law and regulations, must decide how much analysis is needed before making a decision and acting. Analysis must not be an excuse for paralysis.

Deadlines for implementation are important in every initiative for change in every organization.

Implementing reform, a leader must master the available information, make decisions, assign responsibility for action, have a regular reporting mechanism that allows her to monitor progress and performance, and hold people accountable. And then she must get out of the way. "Micro-knowledge" is necessary; micro-management is not.

If you don't have the guts as the leader to make tough and timely decisions, for God's sake, don't take the job.

## Executive Exchange

---

A final, and critical, technique for implementing change is ensuring follow-through.

“It’s Always About People” is the title of the fifth chapter, and it is as helpful as the preceding chapter. Based on experiences from his many years of service, the author offers the following observations:

People, not systems, implement an agenda for change.

People at every level in every organization need to know their work is considered important by the higher-ups. At every level, a leader should strive to make his employees proud to be where they are and doing what they do.

A successful leader, and especially one leading change, treats each member of his team with respect and dignity. It seems obvious, but in far too many bureaucracies bosses at all levels fail to do so.

To lead reform successfully, a leader must empower subordinates.

A successful leader – and reformer – never misses an opportunity to give credit to those working for him as a group and as individuals. He also is willing to let excellent employees move on when they are offered new opportunities or a chance to ascent the ladder.

A successful leader must always be evaluating the people around and below her. She should empower the strong, try to help those who show promise despite shortcomings, and get rid of the deadwood.

Candor is critical to a leader’s success. Every boss needs to understand that creating a climate where people feel comfortable in being honest in their opinions is the cheapest possible job insurance for the person in charge.

Exhausted people make bad decisions and give bad advice.

Accountability is essential to any successful reform effort.

Dr. Gates devotes the sixth chapter to the subject of stakeholders – “legislators, boards of directors, community officials, boards of regents, retirees, alumni, the media, unions, employees, lower-level managers, students, customers, vendors, lobbyists, professional organizations, accrediting boards, investigative bodies, regulators from every level of government, activist organizations, political groups, and on and on” – a critical part of any leader’s job, and particularly those leaders wishing to implement change. Found in this chapter are examples of how the author successfully engaged stakeholders to achieve his objectives.

In Chapter 7 the author discusses characteristics the leader must possess. He writes:

The best leaders have their egos under control.

A leader, or those who aspire to that role, regardless of whether in the public or private sector, must have integrity.

Self-discipline is central to the leadership of institutions and to reforming them.

Intellectual and professional intimidation, characteristic of those who believe they are the smartest people in the room, is a poor way to solicit good ideas and avoid big mistakes.

Courage is essential for reform.

When a leader is fighting bureaucratic battles for reform, she needs a few senior associates who are trustworthy, share a commitment to her agenda for reform, and are capable of effectively implementing her decisions.

In the real world of bureaucratic institutions, you almost never get all you want when you want it. A good leader must compromise, adjust his plans, prioritize, and show flexibility and pragmatism.

One key aspect of successfully reforming institutions, public or private, is taking the work seriously but not yourself. A leader needs to set the example of that principle.

Don’t overstay your welcome.

“Reforming in Scarce Times” is the subject of the eighth chapter, in which Dr. Gates offers suggestions on implementing organizational reforms in an environment of critical oversight and limited funding, noting that during time of budget cuts opportunities may emerge that can positively influence the mission of the organization. The following chapter continues the theme of organizational reform, in which is stressed the importance of the leader’s attention to details and a willingness to acknowledge when something isn’t working.

In the final chapter Dr. Gates draws on wisdom from those of the past regarding public service. Of particular interest was a quote from the Pulitzer Prize winning columnist and Presidential Medal of Freedom recipient Walter Lippmann, one of the first commentators to introduce the concept of the Cold War, who wrote:

Those in high places are more than the administrators of government bureaus. They are more than the writers of laws. They are the custodians of a nation’s ideals, of the beliefs it cherishes, of its permanent hopes, of the faith which makes a nation out of a mere aggregation of individuals.



Following up on Mr. Lippmann's insightful quote, Dr. Gates provides the following thoughts:

If you scratch deeply enough, you will find that most of those in public service – “the custodians” – no matter how outwardly tough or jaded or egotistical, are in their heart of hearts romantics, idealists, and optimists. They actually believe it is possible to make the lives of their fellow citizens better and the world a safer place. But an important part of what makes America unique is that our nation's ideals, hopes, and faith are manifested not only in individuals but in our institutions.

Found on the back of the dust cover are a number of favorable comments about *A Passion for Leadership*, and a majority of them refer to this book being an outstanding memoir; while these assessments are accurate to a point, they are, nevertheless, incomplete. This book is much more than a memoir of a distinguished public servant, and Dr. Gates certainly is one; it is an excellent primer in the study of management, leadership, and successful reformation of bureaucracy. Much can be learned from this interesting, thoughtful, and instructive book, not only by students wishing a career in public service, but by persons working in organizations – public or private – in which they would like to have a greater influence on the mission, culture, and deliverables of those organizations. Persons engaged in teaching leadership courses and those devoted to influencing the organizational culture should feel indebted to the author for this significant contribution to the literature.

Dan Richard Beto

---

### DESISTANCE FROM THE DESISTER'S PERSPECTIVE

---

*Review of Making Good: How Ex-convicts Reform and Rebuild their Lives, by Shadd Maruna, Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association, 2001. Pp. 211, \$19.95 (paperback).*

---

Over the past two decades there has been a renewal of academic and practitioner interest in how and why offenders desist from crime. The subject of desistance has become a topic included in recent community corrections and probation conferences and continues to attract the attention of researchers and practitioners seeking ways to discover and enhance an offender's pathway to a life devoid of crime. Desistance is an attempt to explain how some offenders on the caseloads of probation and parole officers give up criminal activity and begin living prosocial lives. The author of *Making Good*, Shadd Maruna, seeks to explain how offenders reform and rebuild their lives. Dr. Maruna is currently the Dean of Rutgers-Newark's School of Criminal Justice and has a long and distinguished career serving in leadership and teaching capacities at such schools of higher learning as Queen's University Belfast, University of Cambridge (UK), and the State University of New York at Albany. His major research interests are related to desistance from crime, offender rehabilitation, and the psychology of crime. This seminal work was first published in 2001 in which the author received the Michael J. Hindelang Award for the Most

Outstanding Contribution to Criminology from the American Society of Criminology. This book has gone through six printings, the last in 2010, and is considered to be an important work for anyone interested in desistance.

The author begins in his introduction to respond to the general skeptical attitude that offenders are not likely to change and if they do, how do we know for sure! I remember a colleague from a paroling authority who once stated to an audience that we only know that an offender has been rehabilitated when he has died! It is attitudes such as these that require social scientists to search for answers. Dr. Maruna notes that “the idea that bad people can become essentially good seems to contradict a fundamental belief of contemporary society.” If by chance someone reforms then it is proof that he was never really a criminal. This type of logic, according to Dr. Maruna, makes it “almost impossible to contradict the idea that ‘real criminals’ cannot change.” This perspective led to the “creation of bogeymen” and served a social purpose by creating an enemy that fuels the security industry. This “Them” versus “Us” mentality makes rehabilitative efforts difficult and, in fact, had until recently led to an emphasis on incapacitation and in some places changed the role of the correctional system to control those considered chronically bad, and to reduce efforts to correct or change those sentenced to prison. Sentences became longer, parole rates reduced, and until very recently, emphasis on re-entry limited. Against this background the author became interested in finding out why “people who should commit crime according to common wisdom and our best predictive calculations” didn't. This resulted in a new understanding of desistance and this book. Desistance is described as the process whereby “stigmatized former offenders are able to ‘make good’ and create new lives for themselves.” The purpose of this book is to underline the fact that “to successfully maintain the abstinence from crime, ex-offenders need to make sense of their lives. This sense-making commonly takes the form of a life story or self-narrative.”

The book is divided into three sections, with eight chapters and an appendix on additional methodological notes and a very extensive list of references. In the first section – “Dissecting Desistance” – Dr. Maruna defines desistance and describes the research that this book and its arguments are based. The Liverpool Desistance Study was undertaken between 1996 and 1998 in the Merseyside Probation Service in the United Kingdom. The research was based on interviews with 55 men and 10 women whose average age was 30. In reading the description of the research design it is evident that this was a very methodologically robust study.

The second section, titled “Two Views of the Brick Wall,” contains three chapters that cover the social situation in as an objective manner as possible, examines the problem of the persistent offender, and explores what the author sees as good news, namely the possibility that an offender's past need not be a life sentence. Chapter five is the heart of the book and outlines the development of a “redemption script” that is the major contribution of the research study. In the development of this self narrative or story there is no attempt to hide one's past history of crime but an effort to turn the past life into a positive story.

The final section of the book looks at “Applied Mythology,” which examines the capacity of employment, addresses issues of shame, blame, and the core self, and looks at the value of redemptive rituals that might improve efforts towards the reintegration of offenders.

For the most part the author allows the interviewees to speak for themselves and the book uses liberally the stories told by those interviewed. He is able to draw a clear profile of those who persist in their criminal activity and tend to excuse their behavior by blaming external factors and those who desist and who appear to have found reasons to change by receiving recognition of the good in them from those who believe in them. For the author “to make good is to find reason and purpose in the bleakest of life histories.” Therefore by “making good” the offender is not only changed but reconstituted.

This is a hopeful book and an ideal place for probation officers to begin their approach to understanding desistance and the prospective for a desistance-focused practice. It is also an important book because it assists us in demythologizing the prevalent myth of “once a criminal always a criminal.” If this book is not yet in your library I would recommend adding and reading it! I would also like to caution the reader not to fall prey to what C. S. Lewis refers to as “chronological snobbery” by ignoring a book published for the first time nearly 15 years ago and based on research conducted 20 years ago, for to do so will rob you of some very interesting insights that will assist you in your practice.

Donald G. Evans

---

### OUR PREOCCUPATION WITH NEWS

---

*Review of The News: A User's Manual, by Alain de Botton, New York: Penguin Random House, 2014. Pp. 268, \$15.95 (paperback).*

---

Have you ever attempted to keep track of how much you attend to news on all media platforms? How repetitive it can be as well as the lack of serious analysis given to the important stories of the day? I have ceased watching or listening to the news on radio and television after waking up to the news in the morning because the rest of the day is only a repetition of the earlier newscast (Sometimes there is breaking news but then that becomes part of an endless repetitive cycle). So when I was browsing in a book store earlier in the year I notice a small book with an interesting title – especially the subtitle a “user’s manual” – for following the news. Since I was familiar with the author, Alain de Botton, who has written a number of books on themes such as love, travel, architecture, anxiety, happiness, and philosophy, I pick up *The News* as way to start

my reading project for 2016. Botton has a number of bestselling books, among them a delightful one – *How Proust Can Change Your Life* – which I had previously read a number of years ago. The author lives in London, England, and is the founder and chairman of The School of Life and the creative director of Living Architecture. In this book he asserts that news is everywhere and seems to have become the new religion and people find themselves constantly checking their devices for the latest news. Now as the author makes clear there is a broad definition on what constitutes news, and in this book he discusses 25 news stories or events organized under a series of themes, such as: politics, world news, economics, celebrity, disaster, and consumption.

The author uses these 25 news stories, from plane crashes, celebrity activities, a governmental scandal, or a horrific crime and analyses them as to the impact on us and raises questions as to why we find these renditions of daily events so riveting. News coverage is everywhere, but real useful information and analysis seems to have become more difficult to get. Slogans, sound bites, and snapshots prevail, and we are left feeling numb and dumb in regards to what we might do about the issues and events reported. Botton notes: “News stories tend to frame issues in such a way as to reduce our will or even our capacity to imagine them in profoundly other ways.” Throughout the book the author uses literature, art, and philosophy to illuminate the points he is making about news coverage and how he thinks it could be improved and thus more useful to community and nation building.

In the concluding chapter the author selects six types of news in an effort to define what kind of role they might play for us. He selects for comment political, world, economic, celebrity, disaster, and consumer news. Notwithstanding his suggestions for improvement he still feels compelled to end the book with a cautionary note suggesting that we still would have reason for ongoing caution in our consumption of news! This is a very readable book and has many thoughtful ideas and concepts that would provoke the reader’s imagination and assist in looking at news coverage with a different set of lenses. A useful read as we are currently experiencing a “silly season” in politics, there are useful concepts in this book that might assist us in managing the impact of the media in our field of practice and its impact on the public and legislators on issues of crime, law, and justice.

Donald G. Evans

---

## BRIEFLY NOTED

Over the past couple of months a number of reports have been received electronically from governmental agencies, charities, think tanks, and academic institutions that may be of interest to NAPE members.

Dan Richard Beto, Editor

### PROBATION AND PAROLE IN THE UNITED STATES, 2014

The one-percent decline in the number of adults supervised in the community on probation or parole between yearend 2013 and 2014 marked the seventh consecutive year of decline in the population, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) announced on November 19, 2015. In the past seven years, adults under community supervision declined between 0.5 percent and 2.6 percent annually, or by nearly 400,000 offenders over the 7-year period.

Between yearend 2008 and 2014, the probation population fell 10 percent, while the parole population increased nearly 4 percent. Probation is a court-ordered period of supervision in the community, generally used as an alternative to incarceration, and parole is a period of conditional supervised release in the community following a prison term.

An estimated 4.7 million adults were under correctional community supervision in the United States on December 31, 2014, down 45,300 offenders from the same day in 2013. The decline in community supervision was due to a drop in the number on probation that was offset by an increase in the number on parole. Between yearend 2013 and 2014, the probation population decreased by 46,500 offenders (from 3,910,600 to 3,864,100 offenders) while the parole population increase by 1,700 offenders over the same period (from 855,200 to 856,900 offenders).

In addition, between yearend 2013 and 2014 the rate of adults under correctional community supervision declined from 1,947 to 1,910 offenders per 100,000 U.S. adult residents. The rate in 2014 was equivalent to about one in 52 U.S. adult residents.

The report, *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2014*, was written by BJS statisticians Danielle Kaeble, Laura M. Maruschak, and Thomas P. Bonczar, and is available at: <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus14.pdf>.

Information about BJS statistical publications and programs can be found on the BJS website at <http://www.bjs.gov/>.

### CORRECTIONAL POPULATIONS IN THE UNITED STATES, 2014

On December 29, 2015, the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) released *Correctional Populations in the United States, 2014*. This annual report by Lauren Glaze, Danielle Kaeble, Todd Minton, and Anastasios Tsoutis, all BJS statisticians, presents statistics on persons supervised by adult correctional systems in the United States at yearend 2014, including offenders supervised in the community on probation or parole and those incarcerated in state or federal prison or local jail. The report describes the size and change in the total correctional population during 2014. It details the downward trend in the correctional population and correctional supervision rate since 2007. It also examines the impact of changes in the community supervision and incarcerated populations on the total correctional population in recent years. Findings cover the variation in the size and composition of the total

correctional population by jurisdiction at yearend 2014. Appendix tables provide statistics on other correctional populations and jurisdiction-level estimates of the total correctional population by correctional status and sex for select years. Highlights include:

Adult correctional systems supervised an estimated 6,851,000 persons at yearend 2014, about 52,200 fewer offenders than at yearend 2013;

About 1 in 36 adults (or 2.8% of adults in the United States) was under some form of correctional supervision at yearend 2014, the lowest rate since 1996;

The correctional population has declined by an annual average of 1.0% since 2007;

The community supervision population (down 1.0%) continued to decline during 2014, accounting for all of the decrease in the correctional population; and

The incarcerated population (up 1,900) slightly increased during 2014.

This informative annual report may be accessed by visiting the following link: <http://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cpus14.pdf>.

### PUBLICATION HIGHLIGHTS RECOMMENDATIONS FOR YOUTH JUSTICE REFORM

The Youth Transition Funders Group (YTFG) has released an updated version of *A Blueprint for Youth Justice Reform*. This publication outlines ten state and national policy recommendations to improve responses to youth and young adults who are involved in or at risk of entering the juvenile and criminal justice systems. It also offers an overview of the role that philanthropy plays in youth justice reform at the local, state, and national levels.

This publication may be viewed and downloaded at: [http://www.ytfg.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Blueprint\\_8.5x11-SinglePage\\_RGB.pdf](http://www.ytfg.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Blueprint_8.5x11-SinglePage_RGB.pdf).

The Blueprint aligns with YTFG's recent publication *Investing to Improve the Well-Being of Vulnerable Youth and Young Adults: Recommendations for Policy and Practice* available at this link: [http://ytfg.org/2015/12/wellbeing/?utm\\_source=DynamicsMarketing](http://ytfg.org/2015/12/wellbeing/?utm_source=DynamicsMarketing).

### WORLD PRISON POPULATION LIST

Early in February 2016 Helen Fair, a Research Fellow at the Institute for Criminal Policy Research (ICPR) at Birkbeck, University of London, announced the release of the 11th edition of the *World Prison Population List*.

More than 10.35 million people are held in penal institutions throughout the world according to the latest edition of the *World Prison Population List*, researched and compiled by Roy Walmsley and published by the Institute for Criminal Policy Research at Birkbeck, University of London. Including the numbers reported to be held in detention centers in China and in prison camps in North Korea, the total may well be in excess of 11 million.

To read the press release associated with this new publication, visit the following link: <http://www.prisonstudies.org/news/more-1035-million-people-are-prison-around-world-new-report-shows>.

This latest publication may be accessed by going to the following link: [http://www.prisonstudies.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/world\\_prison\\_population\\_list\\_11th\\_edition.pdf](http://www.prisonstudies.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/world_prison_population_list_11th_edition.pdf).

### AMERICAN EXCEPTIONALISM IN PROBATION SUPERVISION

The Robina Institute of Criminal Law and Criminal Justice at the University of Minnesota Law School is pleased to announce new research on *American Exceptionalism in Probation Supervision*. This is the first in a series of Data Briefs that will compare community supervision rates in the United States and Europe.

It is well known that the United States leads the world in incarceration rates. This Data Brief shows that, compared with Europe, America is similarly “exceptional” for its high rates of probation supervision. The average probation supervision rate for all fifty states is more than five times the average rate for all European countries included in the most recent Council of Europe data. Several U.S. states with the highest rates of probation supervision (e.g., Ohio, Rhode Island, Idaho, and Indiana) have rates that are eight-to-nine times the average European rate. Such stark differences exist despite the fact that many countries in Europe have overall crime rates that are quite similar to the U.S.

This Data Brief demonstrates for the first time that America suffers from “mass probation” in addition to “mass incarceration.” Although probation has often been thought of as an “alternative” to prison or jail sentences, the U.S. has achieved exceptional levels of punitiveness in both incarceration and community supervision. Over the past several decades, the number of people under probation supervision in the U.S. has increased greatly. Nearly 4 million adults were under probation supervision across America at year-end 2013. In all reporting European countries, with roughly twice the population of the U.S., only 1.5 million adults were under probation supervision.

Additional information about this project is available at: <http://www.robinainstitute.org/news/new-data-brief-american-exceptionalism-probation-supervision/>.

This and other publications produced by the Robina Institute’s Probation Revocation Project, directed by NAPE past President Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., may be accessed by visiting: <http://www.robinainstitute.org/probation-revocation-project/>.

### TRANSFORMING PRISONS, RESTORING LIVES

On January 26, 2016, the Justice Policy Center of the Urban Institute announced the release of the Charles Colson Task Force on Federal Corrections final report – *Transforming Prisons, Restoring Lives: Final Recommendations of the Charles Colson Task Force on Federal Corrections*. According to Nancy La Vigne, the Center’s Director:

This report reflects over a year of fact finding, data analysis, and stakeholder engagement on the part of Task Force members and staff. The results are a suite of recommendations that are bold, comprehensive, data-driven, and grounded in the research evidence.

This report is available at this link: <http://www.urban.org/research/publication/transforming-prisons-restoring-lives/view/full-report>.

The [Charles Colson Task Force on Federal Corrections](#) is a nine-person, bipartisan, blue-ribbon task force created by Congress to examine challenges in the federal corrections system and develop practical, data-driven solutions. The Urban Institute and its partner, the Center for Effective Public Policy, provided research, analysis, strategic guidance, and logistical support to the Task Force through a cooperative agreement with the Bureau of Justice Assistance, Office of Justice Programs, of the U. S. Department of Justice.

### BRITISH MINISTRY OF JUSTICE RELEASES REPORTS ON JUVENILE JUSTICE ISSUES

The British Ministry of Justice has released two reports focusing on juvenile justice issues.

#### What Works in Managing Young People Who Offend?

This review was commissioned by the Ministry of Justice and considers international literature concerning the management of young people who have offended. It was produced to inform youth justice policy and practice. The review – written by Joanna R. Adler, Sarah K. Edwards, Mia Scally, Dorothy Gill, Michael J. Puniskis, Anna Gekoski, and Miranda A. H. Horvath, all with Forensic Psychological Services at Middlesex University – focuses on the impact and delivery of youth justice supervision, programs and interventions within the community, secure settings, and during transition into adult justice settings or into mainstream society. It does not, however, include studies that focus on early years prevention programs, crime prevention or reduction strategies, or community based approaches that did not involve the direct management of young people who have offended.

This report – *What Works in Managing Young People Who Offend? A Summary of the International Evidence* – may be read by visiting the following link: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/498493/what-works-in-managing-young-people-who-offend.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/498493/what-works-in-managing-young-people-who-offend.pdf).

#### Review of the Youth Justice System

In September 2015 Charlie Taylor, former Chief Executive of the British National College of Teaching and Leadership, was asked to lead a departmental review of the youth justice system for the Ministry of Justice. The review is examining evidence on what works to prevent youth crime and rehabilitate young offenders, and how this is applied in practice; how the youth justice system can most effectively interact with wider services for children and young people; and whether the current delivery models and governance arrangements remain fit for purpose and achieve value for money.

This interim report sets out the initial findings of the review. The final report will be published in July 2016.

This interim report – *Review of the Youth Justice System* – may be read by visiting the following link: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/498736/youth-justice-review.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/498736/youth-justice-review.pdf).

## AUSTRALIAN CRIME: FACTS AND FIGURES – 2014

The Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC) has released a new publication – *Australian Crime: Facts and Figures-2014* – that uses information compiled from a broad range of sources to create an accurate and holistic picture of crime and criminal justice issues in Australia. Within this volume are the patterns and trends relating to specific crimes, victims, offenders, the location of criminal acts and the operation and cost of the criminal justice system, including the police, courts, and prisons.

This AIC report may be accessed by going to either of the following links: [http://aic.gov.au/media\\_library/publications/facts/2014/facts\\_and\\_figures\\_2014.pdf](http://aic.gov.au/media_library/publications/facts/2014/facts_and_figures_2014.pdf) or <http://aic.gov.au/publications/current%20series/facts/1-20/2014.html>.

## THE BRITISH PRIME MINISTER ON PENAL REFORM

On February 8, 2016, British Prime Minister David Cameron spoke at the Policy Exchange on the subject of penal reform. It is interesting to note that many of the criminal justice issues being faced by Great Britain are similar to those found in the United States. The text of that speech may be found below.

Policy Exchange, where this speech was delivered, is the UK's leading think tank. As an educational charity, its mission is to develop and promote new policy ideas which deliver better public services, a stronger society, and a more dynamic economy.

This speech was made available on the Prime Minister's official website and is accessible at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/prison-reform-prime-ministers-speech>.

## THE INTERNET AND DRUG MARKETS

The last decade has seen the emergence of new internet technologies that have acted as important facilitators of online drug markets. The internet now hosts a range of virtual marketplaces – both on the surface and deep web – for selling and buying illicit substances, as well as representing a new arena for health and law enforcement interventions. This first investigation by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Abuse (EMCDDA) into the world of online drug markets brings together state-of-the-art input from over 20 experts – from academia, journalism, and frontline practice – and contributes to the knowledge base on this part of the supply chain.

To read *The Internet and Drug Markets*, visit this link: [http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/system/files/publications/2155/TDXD16001ENN\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/system/files/publications/2155/TDXD16001ENN_FINAL.pdf).

And to learn more about the work of the EMCDDA, visit the following link: <http://www.emcdda.europa.eu/>.

## USSC ISSUES COMPREHENSIVE REPORT ON RECIDIVISM AMONG FEDERAL OFFENDERS

In March 2016 United States Sentencing Commission (USSC) issued a report on the recidivism of federal offenders. The study is groundbreaking in both its breadth – studying all 25,431 U. S. citizen federal offenders released in 2005, and in its duration – following the releasees over an eight year period. To read the press release associated with this report, visit the following link: <http://www.ussc.gov/news/press-releases-and-news-advisories/march-9-2016>.

The Commission found that nearly half (49.3%) of offenders released from prison or placed on a term of probation in 2005 were rearrested within eight years for either a new crime or for some other violation of the technical conditions of their probation or release. To read the summary and key findings, visit this link: <http://www.ussc.gov/research-and-publications/research-publications/2016/recidivism-among-federal-offenders-comprehensive-overview>.

The USSC also found that: 1) most offenders who recidivated did so within the first two years of the follow up period; 2) assault was the most common serious rearrest offense but most rearrest offenses were non-violent in nature; 3) an offender's criminal history as calculated under the federal sentencing guidelines was closely correlated with recidivism rates (rearrest rates ranged from 34% for offenders in the lowest criminal history category to 80% for offenders in the highest criminal history category); and 4) an offender's age at the time of release was also closely correlated with recidivism (rearrest rates ranged from 67% for offenders younger than 21 to 16% for offenders older than 60).

To download the full report, go to the following link: [http://www.ussc.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/research-and-publications/research-publications/2016/recidivism\\_overview.pdf](http://www.ussc.gov/sites/default/files/pdf/research-and-publications/research-publications/2016/recidivism_overview.pdf).

## NEW DRUG COMPENDIUM PUBLISHED BY UNODC

The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC) has published its newly updated third edition of the manual *Terminology and Information on Drugs*. This edition of the publication – the first revision since 2003 – offers a much needed and timely resource, given the evolution and changes in drug markets in recent years.

The content of the manual reflects the need to provide accurate and evidence-based information on the range of substances of abuse; from plant-based drugs such as cocaine and heroin, to synthetic substances such as methamphetamine. It also reflects scheduling decisions of the Commission on Narcotic Drugs in recent years and as such introduces information on newly emerging groups of substances such as synthetic cannabinoid receptor agonists.

Intended for a wide audience and formatted as an accessible and user friendly resource, the publication covers basic concepts and information on substances under international control including definitions of scientific terms, common street names, commonly used forms, routes of administration, and desired or adverse effects.

This new publication may be accessed by visiting this link: [http://www.unodc.org/documents/scientific/Terminology\\_and\\_Information\\_on\\_Drugs-3rd\\_edition.pdf](http://www.unodc.org/documents/scientific/Terminology_and_Information_on_Drugs-3rd_edition.pdf).

## OFFENDER SUPERVISION IN EUROPE

In March 2016 Professor Fergus McNeill with the University of Glasgow, a previous contributor to *Executive Exchange*, issued a new report – *Offender Supervision in Europe* – the result of a lengthy and deliberate process.

This report may be read at: <http://www.offendersupervision.eu/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Final-Report.pdf>.

To learn more about this project, visit the *Offender Supervision in Europe* blog by going to the following link: <http://www.offendersupervision.eu/>.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

ICCA PRESENTS LARIVEE WITH MEAD AWARD



The International Community Corrections Association (ICCA) presented its highest honor – the *Margaret Mead Award* – to **John Larivee**, President and CEO of Community Resources for Justice (CRJ), at its 23rd Annual Research Conference in Boston in November.

Named for the noted anthropologist, the annual award is given to an individual who has demonstrated leadership in the field of

community corrections through innovative thinking, ability to influence public policy, and dedicated service to the ideals and goals of community-based correctional programming resulting in positive outcomes in the United States and abroad.

John Larivee joined CRJ in 1974 and has served as its chief executive since 1985. His career in the field of criminal justice began over 40 years ago when he served as a supervisor of case workers at the Deer Island House of Correction.

An internationally recognized expert in community corrections policy and programs, Larivee has brought innovative and evidence-based practice to CRJ and to the field. Under his leadership, CRJ is today recognized as a leader in the fields of both community corrections programs and a provider of the research, training, and technical assistance needed for state and local jurisdictions to reform criminal justice policy.

In receiving the award, Larivee said he was both honored and humbled. His work has brought collaborations with the National Institute of Justice, National Institute of Corrections, and the U. S. Department of Justice. Larivee has also served as a resource for the Urban Institute’s Reentry Roundtable to examine issues and find solutions to remove the barriers that face offenders returning to their communities.

Larivee is Past President and a founding member of Citizens for Juvenile Justice, and Past President of the International Community Corrections Association.

**2015 DIRECTOR’S AWARDS  
HONOR COURT EMPLOYEES**

Recipients of the Director’s Awards, given by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, were recently announced, and two probation professionals were among those honored. The awards recognize the outstanding leadership and excellence in court operations of federal court employees nationwide.

**The Director’s Award for Outstanding Leadership**

This award recognizes managerial-level employees who demonstrate exemplary stewardship of court resources, while advancing programs with a nationwide impact that improved service to the public.

Among the 2015 recipients was former NAPE member **Melissa Alexander**, Chief U. S. Probation Officer for Middle District of North Carolina (Greensboro), who was recognized for her work in her district and with national probation and pre-trial services system in the implementation of evidence-based practices. She had worked closely with the Administrative Office, sharing the district’s experience with field application of the evidence-based blueprint, and developing a partnership with the National Implementation Research Network to assist in those efforts.

She actively promoted understanding and advancement of risk assessment instruments and core correctional practices through presentations to federal judges, federal public defenders, and law enforcement. In addition she inaugurated a number of cost savings strategies, innovations, and expenditures reductions that allowed the probation office to accomplish its mission while reducing revocation rates and improving services.

**The Director’s Awards for Excellence in  
Court Operations**

This award recognize employees who have contributed to excellence in operating with economy and efficiency, in provided innovations that improve service, or in establishing community outreach programs or enhancing the public’s awareness of the federal Judiciary.

Chief Probation Officer **Edward Scott Chinn** of the District of Connecticut (New Haven) was a recipient of this award. Thanks to his foresight and planning, the Probation Office successfully weathered sequestration cutbacks and downsizing to office personnel. His innovations have allowed the office to maximize treatment dollar and the district’s law enforcement allocation.

At the request of Judge **Stefan R. Underhill**, Chief Chinn created a “support court” for offenders under supervision, which is coordinated with Judge Underhill, the U. S. Attorney’s Office, the Federal Public Defender’s Office, and the U. S. Marshals Service. Thanks to the program, and other innovations initiated by him, the district’s re-arrest and revocation rates are now well below the national rates. His leadership has facilitated the fair administration of justice and made a positive difference in the lives of those under supervision in the district.

**NEW DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS  
APPOINTED IN MASSACHUSETTS**

In January 2016 Massachusetts Commissioner of Probation **Edward J. Dolan** appointed **Vincent L. Lorenti** as the new Director of the Office of Community Corrections (OCC), a division of the Massachusetts Probation Service which is comprised of 18 community supervision centers across the state.

As the new Director, Lorenti is responsible for managing the overall operation of the statewide OCC program where intermediate sanctions for probationers are enforced. Individuals sentenced to the centers must check in several times weekly, and participate in substance abuse treatment, HiSet (Massa-

chusetts High School Equivalency Testing) Program preparation and job training. Lorenti's duties also include managing the Massachusetts Trial Court Community Service Program through which probationers perform such tasks as park clean-up, snow removal, and delivery of food to soup kitchens in lieu of paying court fees.

"Vincent Lorenti brings nearly two decades of experience in the Office of Community Corrections to this position and has a strong vision for the program which employs both intermediate sanctions and evidence-based practices to reduce recidivism among this high-risk population," said Probation Commissioner Edward J. Dolan.

Lorenti said of his new appointment, "Community Corrections is about making the communities we live and work in stronger and safer. Our community corrections centers incorporate evidence-based practice in an enhanced supervision approach that will be the cornerstone of criminal justice. The opportunity to continue this work with the dedicated staff at the Office of Community Corrections, community corrections centers, probation departments, community-based service providers, sheriffs' departments and our partners at parole is truly a privilege. I look forward to working together with all of these stakeholders, judges, and others to shape a criminal justice approach that works with, and for, communities across the Commonwealth."

He began his career with Probation as a Court Services Coordinator at the Suffolk County Community Corrections Center in 1998 after working as an intern while a student at Boston College. Lorenti later served as a Program Specialist at OCC where he worked with staff from the Massachusetts Sentencing Commission to develop data collection procedures and performance metrics for community corrections centers.

Lorenti earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in political science from Boston College in 1998, and a Juris Doctor from Suffolk University Law School in 2006. Lorenti was admitted to the Massachusetts Bar in 2011. He completed the Commonwealth Management Certificate Program in 2014. Lorenti has also received training certificates in Drug Abuse Recognition, co-occurring Disorders and Integrated Treatment Strategies, Trauma-informed Treatment and Criminal Justice Treatment Planning. He is a certified trainer of the NIDA/SAMSHA Blending Initiative program, Promoting Awareness of Motivational Incentives (Contingency Management).

### NEW CHIEF NAMED IN SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

According to a press release from the San Diego Board of Supervisors, **Adolfo Gonzales**, Chief of the Bureau of Investigation for the District Attorney's Office, has been named Chief Probation Officer for San Diego County, California. At the helm of the Probation Department, Gonzales will manage approximately 1,250 employees, who work with 11,400 adult and 2,000 juvenile offenders.

Gonzales, who joined the District Attorney's Office in 2013, has nearly four decades of criminal justice and law enforcement experience, including serving as National City Chief of Police for eight years. He began his career with the San Diego Police Department in 1978 and worked his way up to Assistant Chief, a position he held for three years.

"Chief Gonzales has an exceptional and broad record of service in San Diego law enforcement, working with our partner agencies, as well as community groups and residents," Board of Supervisors Chairman **Ron Roberts** said in a statement. "We are thrilled to welcome him to the Probation Department and know he will bring a remarkable level of expertise and passion to that role."

Gonzales has served on the board of Reach One Teach One, a nonprofit organization that provides mentoring to youth considered at-risk and involved in gangs, according to a press release.

The new Chief holds a master's degree in education from San Diego State University and a doctorate of education in leadership science from University of San Diego.

Gonzales succeeds **Mack Jenkins**, who retired after four decades of service to the criminal justice profession.

### GIRALDO APPOINTED TO CALIFORNIA BOARD

On February 22, 2016, California Governor **Edmund G. Brown, Jr.**, announced the appointment of **Fernando Giraldo** of Aptos to the California Sex Offender Management Board.

Giraldo has been Chief Probation Officer at the Santa Cruz County Probation Department since 2013, where he has served in several positions since 1995, including assistant chief probation officer, juvenile division director, assistant superintendent, assistant probation division director, and deputy probation officer. He was a treatment coordinator and counselor at Triad Community Services from 1990 to 1995. Giraldo earned a Master of Social Work degree from San Jose State University.

This position does not require Senate confirmation and there is no compensation. Giraldo is a Democrat.

### GEORGIA WOMAN DEFEATS PRIVATE PROBATION COMPANY IN COURT

According to an article by **Sandy Hodson** appearing in the *Augusta Chronicle*, in February 2016, at the end of a five-day trial in Richmond County Superior Court in Augusta, Georgia, the jury deliberated for about two hours before returning a verdict in **Kathleen Hucks'** favor, awarding her \$50,000 in damages and \$125,000 in attorney fees. It did not find that Hucks should be awarded punitive damages.

Hucks is one of more than a dozen people who have filed suit against **Sentinel Offender Services** in Richmond and Columbia counties, accusing the private probation company of using its ability to secure arrest warrants to raise its profits.

### MASSACHUSETTS PROBATION COMMISSIONER APPOINTS SIX NEW CHIEF PROBATION OFFICERS

According to a recent press release, Massachusetts Commissioner of Probation **Edward J. Dolan** appointed six new Chief Probation Officers in District and Boston Municipal (BMC) courts across the state earlier this year.

"The promotion of these individuals to Chief Probation Officers places them in a critical management and leadership role within the Service. Their selection is recognition of their talent, dedication, and passion for the dual mission of the Service which is to maintain the safety of our communities while guiding those

individuals in our care and custody toward a better path in life.” said Commissioner Dolan.

Fall River District Court Chief **Donelle Gomes-Talley** began her new position on February 8. Gomes-Talley first joined the service as a Probation Officer at the court in 1988. In May 2013, she was promoted to Assistant Chief Probation Officer. Gomes-Talley earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in 1987 in sociology from Boston College and a master’s degree in rehabilitative counseling from Assumption College in 1997.

Worcester Superior Court Chief **Jean Curtin** started her new job on February 7. Curtin first came to the Service in 1983 to work as an Essex Superior Court Probation Officer. Two years later, she transferred to Worcester Superior Court. In 2007, she was promoted to Assistant Chief Probation Officer at the court. Curtin earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology from Westfield State College in 1979 and a master’s degree in Education from Springfield College in guidance and psychological services in 1980.

Lynn District Chief **G. Joseph Pennucci** assumed his new role on February 8. Prior to his appointment, Pennucci was Assistant Chief Probation Officer at the Lynn Court, a position he was promoted to in 2005. Pennucci began his career as a Probation Officer in Lynn in 1987. He is a 1984 graduate of Cook College-Rutgers University where he earned a Bachelor of Science degree in economics.

Brookline District Court Chief Probation Officer **Jeffrey Jarasitis** started his new position on February 22. A former Assistant Chief Probation Officer at Dedham District Court, Jarasitis first joined the service as a Suffolk Juvenile Probation Officer in 1998. In 2008, he was appointed Assistant Chief Probation Officer at Dedham District Court. Jarasitis is a 1987 graduate of St. Anslem College where he earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in English. In 1997, he earned a master’s degree in communications from Emerson College.

Taunton District Court Chief Probation Officer **Kelly Hamilton-Welzel** was named chief and began her new job on February 22. Hamilton-Welzel has served in the positions of Associate Probation Officer at Fall River District Court, Bristol Superior Probation Officer, Acting Assistant Chief Probation Officer at Bristol Juvenile and Bristol Superior Courts, and Assistant Chief at Wrentham District Court. She is a 1993 graduate of Syracuse University where she majored in public communications. Hamilton-Welzel holds a master’s degree in public administration from Anna Maria College which she earned in 2012.

Boston Municipal Court (BMC)–Brighton Chief **Michael Dube** started his new job on February 29. Dube served as acting chief at BMC–Brighton prior to his appointment as chief. He first joined the Service as a Suffolk Probate and Family Court Probation Officer in 1995 before transferring to Framingham District Court in 1996. Dube was promoted to Assistant Chief Probation Officer in Framingham in 2013. He is a 1990 alumnus of Merrimack College where he earned a Bachelor of Science degree in Political science. He also received a master’s degree in criminal justice from Northeastern University in 1992.

There are 62 District Courts and eight divisions of the Boston Municipal Court, including: Brighton, Central, Charlestown, Chelsea, East Boston, Roxbury, South Boston, and West Roxbury. The District and BMC Probation Departments supervise criminal cases.

## NAPE PRESIDENT ADDRESSES PROBATION PROFESSIONALS IN EL PASO, TEXAS

In late January 2016 NAPE President **Marcus Hodges** visited El Paso, Texas. During his visit he spent one day with the El Paso County Juvenile Probation Department headed by Chief Juvenile Probation Officer **Roger Martinez**, and spent a second day with the El Paso County Community Supervision and Corrections Department, headed by **Magdalena Morales-Aina**.

His presentations – “How to Make 2016 the Greatest Year Ever” – focused on change and the organizational culture, communication, and work/life balance.

## TUTTLE RETIRES IN PENNSYLVANIA

In March 2016 **John R. Tuttle** retired following a distinguished career in the Pennsylvania criminal justice system. At the time of his retirement, Tuttle was a member of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole.

Tuttle, who served as President of the National Association of Probation Executives from 2008 to 2010, recorded close to four decades of service in the probation and parole field in Pennsylvania, commencing in 1978 when he was a line probation officer in York County. He was promoted to supervisor and then Chief Adult Probation Officer from 1997 to 2000. In 2000, Tuttle became the Board’s Central Region Director, serving in that capacity until 2002. That year, he was named the Board’s Director of the Office of Probation and Parole Services and was promoted in 2006 to Deputy Executive Director.

On December 16, 2009, Tuttle was confirmed by the Senate to begin his first term as a Board Member and re-confirmed on March 16, 2010. Tuttle was named Acting Chairman on December 30, 2014, by Governor **Tom Corbett**, a position he held until October 5, 2015.

Tuttle, who earned a bachelor’s degree in sociology from Thiel College and a master’s degree in the administration of justice from Penn State University, has served as an adjunct lecturer at York College and has volunteered as a football coach and mentor in the York community.

In addition to NAPE, Tuttle is a member of the American Probation and Parole Association, American Correctional Association, and the Pennsylvania Probation, Parole, and Corrections Association.

A retirement reception for Tuttle was held on March 14, 2016, at the Appalachian Brewery in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

## COCONINO COUNTY ADULT PROBATION DEPARTMENT TO GET NEW CHIEF

According to an article appearing in the *Arizona Daily Sun*, the Coconino County Adult Probation Department in Arizona will get a new leader next month. On March 3, 2016, county offi-





cials announced that Coconino County Superior Court Presiding **Judge Mark R. Moran** has selected **Sarah Douthit** as the next Chief Probation Officer, effective April 13. Douthit will take over for outgoing Chief Probation Officer **Cindy Winn**, who is scheduled to retire April 12 after 30 years with the Adult Probation Department.

“Sarah has a reputation of being a strong collaborator in our community, working with other departments, agencies and non-profits to bring about change in the criminal justice system,” said Moran in a press release. “She has the passion, drive and force to continue the forward movement of the department.”

For the past seven years Douthit has served as the county’s Deputy Chief Probation Officer. Previously, she worked for the Administrative Office of the Courts as a program specialist and as a probation officer for Pinal County.

Douthit earned a bachelor’s degree in philosophy from Arizona State University and a master’s degree in education from Northern Arizona University.

When she is not working, Douthit volunteers with multiple organizations. She currently serves as chair of the Goodwill Industries of Northern Arizona Board of Directors.

### SEVEN NEW FELLOWS APPOINTED TO THE PROBATION INSTITUTE

The Probation Institute, an independent not-for-profit organization based in London, England, announced in March 2016 the appointment of seven new fellows: **Lol Burke**, Editor of Probation Journal; **Paul Davies**, Specialist legal adviser on justice and probation; **Paul Hindson**, Working Links Managing Director for UK Justice; **Heather Munro**, OBE, former Chief Executive of London Probation Trust; **Alan Plumb**, career probation and rehabilitation training specialist; **Dave Walton**, former Chief Officer and pioneer of Integrated Offender Management; and **David Ward**, Professor of Social and Community Studies at De Montfort University.

“At the Probation Institute we are committed to harnessing people’s experience as well as the latest research to guide on-going developments in rehabilitation and improve best practice,” said **Savas Hadjipavlou**, Institute Chief Executive. “These current and recent leaders bring to the Probation Institute a vast pool of knowledge and experience in probation and rehabilitation. This is invaluable as we move through uncertain and unsettling times in the justice sector.”

As a center of excellence on probation practice, the Probation Institute applies rigorous standards to the assessment of research and best practice. The Institute provides professional leadership for probation workers, and all those who deliver services that protect the public and rehabilitate offenders. It acts to link probation professionals across the private, public and

voluntary sectors. Additional information about the mission and deliverables of the Probation Institute may be found at this link: <http://probation-institute.org/>.

### NEW PROBATION LEADERSHIP APPOINTED IN UTAH

During the first week of March 2016, **Rollin Cook**, Executive Director of the Utah Department of Corrections, appointed **James Hudspeth** as the new Director of the Division of Adult Probation and Parole (AP&P). In addition, he appointed **Glenn Ercanbrack** as the new Regional Administrator for Adult Probation and Parole Region 3 (Salt Lake, Summit and Tooele counties).

Hudspeth has served as Acting Director of the Division of Adult Probation and Parole since February 11 of this year. He was appointed Chief of the Department’s Law Enforcement Bureau in 2013. Prior to that, he was the Administrator for AP&P Region 3; he also served for a year as Administrator for AP&P Region 4. Hudspeth joined the Department in 1997 and worked as a correctional officer at the Bonneville Community Correctional Center; as an adult probation and parole agent; and as an investigator and investigations supervisor.

Hudspeth started his criminal justice career in 1992 with the Honolulu Police Department. He was honorably discharged from the U. S. Marine Corps after serving for ten years.

“Jim’s work ethic and leadership ability has proven to be off-the-charts throughout his career with the Department,” Cook said in announcing the appointment.

Ercanbrack has served as Director of the Inmate Placement Program since February 2008. He was specifically brought in to address challenges the Department had at the time with State inmates housed in 21 county jails. During his tenure, Ercanbrack established tremendous rapport with county sheriffs and commissioners. He updated the Department’s policies and procedures related to jail contracting and also established a detailed audit/inspection team that ensures jails are in compliance with Utah Jail Standards.

Ercanbrack joined the Department in 1994 and has worked as an adult probation and parole agent, in the Investigations Bureau as a Field Training Officer, and as a Captain in the Division of Institutional Operations. Ercanbrack spent three years as the assistant regional administrator for AP&P’s Northern Utah Region, where he oversaw the Northern Utah Community Correctional Center.

“I have come to regard Glenn, who has 22 years with the Department, as one of the most capable leaders in our organization,” Cook said. “He has a great ability to solve problems and complete projects and to ensure his staff has opportunities for growth.”

# NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES

## Who We Are

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

## What We Do

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

## Why Join

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

## Types of Membership

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

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

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

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

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

## Membership Application

NAME \_\_\_\_\_ TITLE \_\_\_\_\_

AGENCY \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

TELEPHONE # \_\_\_\_\_ FAX # \_\_\_\_\_ E-MAIL \_\_\_\_\_

DATE OF APPLICATION \_\_\_\_\_

<b>CHECK</b>	Regular	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 50 / 1 year	Organizational	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 250 / 1 year
	Membership	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 95 / 2 years	Corporate	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 500 / 1 year
	Desired	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 140 / 3 years	Retired	<input type="checkbox"/> \$ 25 / 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

---

# NAPE

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES  
*www.napehome.org*



**Sam Houston State University**

MEMBER THE TEXAS STATE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM™

*www.shsu.edu*

---