

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

SPRING 2018

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

“Trade your expectation for appreciation and the world changes instantly.” –Tony Robbins

A friend of mine, Aaron Montgomery (great motivational speaker), and his wife traveled to Hawaii a couple of months ago. During their vacation they explored the beautiful island and had a wonderful vacation. On their last day both were standing on the balcony of their hotel looking at the ocean when they both received a text message that stated, “you have fifteen minutes to take cover, incoming inter-continental ballistic missile!” What would you do? Aaron Googled how much damage an inter-continental ballistic missile could cause, while his wife sat in despair. That took up five minutes, so now he only had ten minutes left. After his research he determined that their chance of survival was slim, therefore he and his wife decided to call their family and say good bye. A couple of minutes into the conversation they received another text. It stated that the initial text was done in error. Initially, after being scared and very upset he pondered his decision about the phone call to his family and thought about all of the other people he did not call just to say thank you or express his gratitude for those that have helped him along the way. We all have very busy lives that include leading complex organizations. We make decisions every day that have positive and negative impacts. Therefore, today I choose to express my gratitude for those who are making a positive impact on our profession. (Please note I could only highlight a couple.)

Thanks to the American Probation and Parole Association for being a dynamic organization for our profession and continuing to be a force for positive change.

Thanks to the National Institute of Corrections (Greg Crawford) for creating the Community Corrections Collaborative Network that informs, guides, and provides input



around the pressing issues facing the field of community corrections.

Thanks to all community corrections agencies that have implemented evidence based practices. As we all know, these practices when implemented with fidelity can drastically reduce recidivism, thus creating safer communities and fewer victims.

Thanks to Vincent Schiraldi and team for continuing the dialogue about radically reforming American’s parole and probation systems and shrinking these systems so they can produce better outcomes.

Thanks to Probation Officer Tiffany Whitner, Pinal County for showing us the power of engagement and how we can change lives by being non-judgmental and compassionate.

Thanks to Michael Nail, Commissioner of the Georgia Department of Community Supervision for their innovative practices that include mobile supervision, and the use of body cameras to ensure motivational interviewing techniques are being conducted with fidelity.

Thanks to all my community corrections colleagues. Warren Bennis stated, “Leadership is not a Spectator Sport.” It takes hard work, diligence, patience and effort to produce the results that all of us are striving for.

Lastly, I challenge all to take the time to express your gratitude for those who have made an impact in your organization and communities.

Marcus M. Hodges
President

In addition to serving as the President of NAPE, **Marcus Hodges** is employed as the Associate Director at the Court Services Offender Supervision Agency for the District of Columbia.

CONTENTS

President’s Message, <i>Marcus M. Hodges</i>	1
Editor’s Message, <i>Brian Mirasolo</i>	2
NAPE Events in Philadelphia, <i>Christie Davidson</i>	2
2018 NAPE Elections, <i>Christie Davidson</i>	4
An Interview with Dr. Mark Kleiman, <i>Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Ed.D.</i>	5
Too Big to Succeed: The Impact of the Growth of Community Corrections and What Should be Done About It, <i>Columbia University Justice Lab</i>	6
38 Leadership Principles from the Greatest Business, Military, Political and Sports Leaders, <i>Ryan Holiday</i>	12
From the Bookshelf, <i>Todd Jermstad, J.D., Dan Richard Beto, Donald G. Evans, and Jaime Tilston</i>	17
News from the Field	25

EDITOR'S MESSAGE

by

Brian Mirasolo

I hope 2018 is off to a good start for all of you. As we settle into the first quarter of the year the next edition of *Executive Exchange* is here. Thanks to all of the contributors for the high quality content.

Ron Corbett contributed an interview he conducted with Dr. Mark Kleiman from New York University. Dr. Kleiman, like Ron, has contributed a lot to the field of community corrections and is currently a Professor of Public Policy at the NYU Marron Institute of Urban Management. The interview provides observations on how to improve outcomes, and what makes for an effective public administrator.

Additionally, you'll find a very recent article, "Too Big to Succeed: The Impact of the Growth of Community Corrections and What Should be Done About It," published by the Columbia University Justice Lab that Marcus Hodges, Dan Beto, and Ron Corbett all played a role in.

Author Ryan Holiday allowed us to reprint an article on leadership he wrote late last year that appeared in *Thought Catalog*. The article, titled "38 Leadership Principles From the Greatest Business, Military, Political, and Sports Leaders," was something very helpful for me to reflect upon in my own work and I

hope you find it to be the same for you. Ryan is the author of six books, and writes extensively on leadership.



Todd Jermstad, Dan Beto, Don Evans, and Jaime Tilston submitted very informative book reviews. Some of the topics touched on the impact of mass incarceration, the role of money in the justice system, and motivational interviewing. There is also a great review of the 2017 edition of the *Irish Probation Journal*.

Finally there is the "News From the Field" column, in which a number members of NAPE contribute to keep us up to date on what is going on around the country.

Respectfully,
Brian

Brian Mirasolo, the Field Services Administrator for the Massachusetts Probation Service, serves as the Editor for *Executive Exchange*. For those interested in contributing material to *Executive Exchange*, Brian can be reached by phone at 617-909-3102 or by email at bmirasolo@gmail.com.

NAPE EVENTS IN PHILADELPHIA

Members of the National Association of Probation Executives are encouraged to attend organizational activities on July 28-29, 2018, at the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

EXCLUSIVE MEMBERS RECEPTION

On Saturday, July 28, 2018, at 5:00 PM, the NAPE Members Reception will take place at the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown; this event immediately precedes the Annual Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association. The Association will present the annual awards during the Members Reception.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING

On Sunday, July 29, 2018, at 9:00 AM, the NAPE Board of Directors will meet at the Philadelphia Marriott Downtown to conduct organizational business. Additional information will be forthcoming regarding specific room assignments for these two events. If you have any questions, feel free to contact me at davidson@shsu.edu.

Christie Davidson
Executive Director

2018 NAPE ELECTIONS

This year, the first in a number of years, the National Association of Probation Executives has contested races for the offices of President and Vice President.

CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT

Leighton Iles

Leighton Iles has over a quarter of a century of experience in adult probation and is currently the Director of the Tarrant County Community Supervision and Corrections Department (CSCD) in Fort Worth, Texas, overseeing a staff of 360, 21,000 offenders, and an annual budget exceeding \$25 million. Tarrant County is the third most populous county in Texas.

Prior to moving to Tarrant County in August 2009, he served as Director of the Fort Bend County CSCD where he was employed for twelve years. Mr. Iles previously worked for the Community Justice Assistance Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (CJAD-TDCJ) in substance abuse programming. He began his career in Austin, Texas, as a probation officer for the Travis County Adult Probation Department.

Mr. Iles earned a bachelor's degree in criminal justice and a Master of Public Administration degree, both from Texas State University. He is Past President of the Texas Corrections Association, serves as a Regional Representative for the American Probation and Parole Association, and a member of the Texas Probation Association's Legislative Committee.

In recognition of his leadership in community corrections, in 2016 Mr. Iles was recognized by the National Association of Probation Executives with the *Sam Houston State University Probation Executive of the Year Award*. He was also recognized by the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University with the *Defensor Pacem Award*, its highest honor.

In 2015 Mr. Iles was a member of a criminal justice delegation to Poland organized by the Correctional Management Institute of Texas and the Polish Prison Service and the following year he returned to Poland as part of a delegation organized by the International Committee of the National Association of Probation Executives.

Mr. Iles has been aggressive in seeking out grants to better serve the offender population and he has been an innovator in employing emerging technologies in the management of his department. He works closely with universities and is a strong proponent of evidenced-based practices.

Francine Perretta

Francine Perretta, who devoted approximately four decades to the human services and criminal justice systems, is Executive Director of the Association of Women Executives in Corrections.

Ms. Perretta is the retired Deputy Commissioner of the Westchester County Department of Corrections in White Plains, New York, a position she held for a little more than six years. As Deputy Commissioner she managed and supervised a staff of 199 and oversaw a budget of \$42 million.

Prior to moving to Westchester County, Ms. Perretta was employed by the St. Lawrence County Department of Probation in Canton, New York, from September 1979 to November 2010; the

last thirteen years she served as the agency's Director, where she managed a staff of 50 and oversaw a budget of \$1.9 million.

During her time with the St. Lawrence County Department of Probation Ms. Perretta also served as Coordinator of the criminal justice program at Mater Dei College for a year and a half and as Acting Director of Public Health for the St. Lawrence Public Health Department for a year. Prior to entering the field of probation, Ms. Perretta served as a Caseworker for the St. Lawrence County Department of Social Services.

Ms. Perretta holds a bachelor's degree in social work from Plattsburgh State University and a master's degree in counseling and education from St. Lawrence University. She is a Past President of the Association of Women Executives in Corrections, an Affiliate Representative for the American Probation and Parole Association, and Secretary of the National Association of Probation Executives.

In 2016 the National Association of Probation Executives presented Ms. Perretta with the *George M. Keiser Award for Leadership*. As for international experience, Ms. Perretta was a member of a criminal justice delegation to South Africa.

Ms. Perretta is frequently called upon to provide training in subjects related to community corrections and women's leadership.

CANDIDATES FOR VICE PRESIDENT

Leo Dunn

Leo Dunn, who received a Juris Doctor degree cum laude from Widener University School of Law in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, in 2007 and three Bachelor of Science degrees from Penn State University in 1987, serves as Chairman of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole.

Earlier, Mr. Dunn had a solo law practice and was an Adjunct Professor of Law at Widener University.

Mr. Dunn has served the citizens of the Commonwealth for over 26 years for two state agencies. He was appointed Director of Policy and Legislative Affairs for the Board of Probation and Parole in 2012 after working nine years as an Assistant Director. Prior to working for the Board, Mr. Dunn spent 15 years with the Department of Agriculture serving in various roles. He was instrumental in the original development of the PA Preferred Program. He has served as a member of the Juvenile Act Advisory Committee, the Homeless Program Coordination Committee, the Mental Health Justice Advisory Committee at the Commission for Crime and Delinquency, and as chair of the GLBT Rights Committee and as a Council Member for the Solo and Small Firm Section of the Pennsylvania Bar Association.

He currently serves as the Vice Chair of the Pennsylvania Bar Association's Corrections System Committee. Mr. Dunn is a northern Pennsylvania native. He is the first openly gay Board Member.

Mr. Dunn was confirmed by the Senate as a Board Member of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole on December

Executive Exchange

9, 2015, and on March 15, 2016, Governor Tom Wolf appointed him Chairman.

Kathryn Liebers

Kathryn Liebers was appointed Chief Probation Officer in Norfolk, Nebraska, in April 2007. She began her criminal justice career as a probation officer in Alliance in June 1981, and transferred to Norfolk in April 1986. She was appointed Chief Deputy in July 2004.

Ms. Liebers earned a Bachelor of Science degree in criminal justice from the University of Nebraska at Omaha with a minor in English, and has accumulated 16 hours towards a master's degree from Wayne State College. She completed the U. S. Department of Justice's National Institute of Corrections Executive Orientation Program at Sam Houston State University as well as the Management Development Certification Program from the University of Nebraska at Lincoln.

She is currently the chairperson of Probation's Policy Development Committee and has served on the Substance Abuse Committee, Public Relations Committee, Personnel Committee, and the Community Corrections Programs Committee. She serves on the board for the WELL Women's Halfway House in Norfolk.

CANDIDATES FOR UNCONTESTED OFFICES

The following offices are uncontested. In accordance with the constitution, in those cases where only one person has been nominated for an office, the Secretary/Executive Director shall cast a unanimous ballot for that person.

SECRETARY

Harriet Beasley is a Regional Supervisor in the Office of the Commissioner of Probation in Boston, Massachusetts.

TREASURER

Javed Syed is Director of the Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Dallas, Texas.

NEW ENGLAND REGION

Kevin Martin is Chief Probation Officer for the Massachusetts Trial Court, Bristol Juvenile Probation, in Taunton, Massachusetts.

MID-ATLANTIC REGION

Michael Fitzpatrick is Chief U. S. Probation Officer for the Southern District of New York, New York, New York.

CENTRAL REGION

Linda Brady is Chief Probation Officer for the Monroe Circuit Court Probation Department in Bloomington, Indiana.

SOUTHERN REGION

Tobin Lefler is Director of the Cameron/Willacy Counties Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Brownsville, Texas.

WESTERN REGION

David Birch is a District Manager with the Idaho Department of Corrections in Boise, Idaho.

AT LARGE

Susan Burke is Director of the Utah Division of Juvenile Justice Services in Salt Lake City, Utah.

AT LARGE

Michael Nail is Commissioner of the Georgia Department of Community Supervision in Atlanta, Georgia.

Ballots will be distributed to the membership on or before April 30, 2018. Your participation in this election will be deeply appreciated.

Christie Davidson
Executive Director

AN INTERVIEW WITH DR. MARK KLEIMAN

by

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Ed.D.

Dr. Ron Corbett recently interviewed Dr. Mark Kleiman of New York University for *Executive Exchange*. A number of community corrections topics are touched upon in this informative interview.

Mark Kleiman is a Professor of Public Policy at the NYU Marron Institute of Urban Management and at NYU Wagner. At Marron, he leads the Crime and Justice program. Professor Kleiman's recent work includes methods for accommodating imperfect rational decision-making in policy, designing deterrent regimes that take advantage of positive-feedback effects, and the substitution of swiftness and predictability for severity in the criminal justice system.

Prior to joining NYU, he served as a Professor of Public Policy at UCLA's Luskin School of Public Affairs. Previously, he taught at Harvard's John F. Kennedy School of Government, and served as a Visiting Professor at the University of Virginia Batten School and as the first Thomas C. Schelling Professor at the University of Maryland. Kleiman is also an adjunct scholar at the Center for American Progress, and has been a visiting professor at Harvard Law School. Kleiman was a legislative aide to Congressman Les Aspin (1974-1975) and a special assistant to Polaroid CEO Edwin Land (1975-1976). From 1977 to 1979, he was Deputy Director for Management and Director of Program Analysis for the Office of Management and Budget of the City of Boston. Between 1979 and 1983, Kleiman worked for the Office of Policy and Management Analysis in the Criminal Division of the U.S. Department of Justice, and from 1982-1983 he was the director of the same office, and a member of the National Organized Crime Planning Council.

Professor Kleiman attended Haverford College, graduating with a B.A. in Economics (honors), Philosophy (honors), and Political Science (high honors). For his graduate education, Kleiman attended John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University, earning an M.P.P. in Public Policy in 1974 and a Ph.D. in Public Policy in 1983.

Ron Corbett: *Based on your work and observations, what would you be inclined to advise community corrections leaders to do to improve outcomes?*

Mark Kleiman:

At the organizational level:

1. Define your goals in terms of outcomes that matter to the public and to probationers.
2. Measure how well you're doing against those goals, organization-wide and subunit-by-subunit.
3. Mine the organization for new ideas; line staff, first-line supervisors, and probationers themselves will astound you with their creativity if you make it clear you value their thoughts rather than only their compliance with the rulebook.
4. Test those ideas with quick randomized trials. Make your department an organization that learns from its environment and continuously improves every one of its processes.
5. Resist the pressure to make the offender population a cash cow. Your agency does a public service, and the taxpayers ought to support it.

At the individual-case level:

1. Figure out which probationers you need to control, which ones you can help, and which ones would benefit most from a good leaving-alone. (And no, you don't need an expensive, time-consuming proprietary "tool" to do that.)
2. For the people you want to control and help, define a small group of measurable behaviors that, if changed, would make a difference to their well-being and to public safety. Use swift-certain-fair rewards and punishments to give them incentives to change those behaviors. Don't overwhelm them with dozens of irrelevant rules.

3. Punishment is expensive and harmful. Use as little of it as necessary to achieve the behavior changes you want. Less is more. Keep experimenting until you find the minimum effective dose of any given sanction. There is precisely zero evidence that a sanction of three months in jail for a technical violation is more effective than a night in jail, or a weekend on a 9pm curfew.

4. In addition to influencing current behavior, your goal should be to change habits and ways of thinking in beneficial directions. If that's the case, you need to start measuring those characteristics and how they change while people are under your supervision.

Ron Corbett: *What trends in our field interest you the most?*

Mark Kleiman:

The substitution of information-gathering and information-processing technology for work-hours.
The substitution of swiftness and certainty for severity.

Ron Corbett: *Will we see a significant decline in prison populations over next decade?*

Mark Kleiman:

Probably. But "significant" is way short of "adequate." The U. S. incarceration rate is 5 times our historical norm and 7 times the level in other advanced democracies. We're back to roughly 1963 crime rates; we should be working to get back to 1963 incarceration rates. That would mean having 80% fewer people behind bars. We could do that, and we could do that without sacrificing public safety. But only if the community-corrections system transforms itself in radical ways.

Executive Exchange

Ron Corbett: *What characterizes the most effective public administrators?*

Mark Kleiman:

They set goals; they delegate authority; and they enforce accountability.

And they love the people who work for them.

Ron Corbett: *What accounts for the stubborn post-release recidivism numbers, which seems not to have moved in 40 years?*

Mark Kleiman:

1. The transition from prison back to civilian life is way too sudden. You can't move someone overnight from 100% security and no liberty to 100% liberty and no security and expect him to do well.

2. The post-release supervision system has too many rules, and enforces them inconsistently but with semi-random harshness.

3. The services budget is over-invested in telling people to behave better (drug treatment, anger management classes) and under-invested in providing for their basic needs, most of all for housing.

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., is the former Acting Commissioner of the Massachusetts Probation Service. He currently serves as a faculty member at the University of Massachusetts-Lowell's College of Criminology and Justice Studies. He is Past-President of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE). Dr. Corbett has published widely, including articles in *Federal Probation*, *Corrections Today*, and *Justice Quarterly*. His publications include *Transforming Probation Through Leadership: The "Broken Windows" Model*, published by the Manhattan Institute. He served for several years as Editor of *Perspectives*, the journal of the American Probation and Parole Association (APPA), and Co-editor of the "Up to Speed" column in *Federal Probation*. Ron has been the recipient of the American Probation and Parole Association's Sam Houston State University Award (1990) recognizing publications by a practitioner, the William Haskell Memorial Distinguished Teaching Award (1990) from the University of Massachusetts-Lowell, the Manson-Robinson Award (1994) of the New England Council on Crime and Delinquency for contributions to criminal justice, and the Probation Executive of the Year Award (1997) from the National Association of Probation Executives.

TOO BIG TO SUCCEED: THE IMPACT OF THE GROWTH OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS AND WHAT SHOULD BE DONE ABOUT IT

by

Columbia University Justice Lab

The Justice Lab at Columbia University recently published this article online. A number of NAPE members were signatories, including President Marcus Hodges, Dan Richard Beto, and Ronald P. Corbett, Jr. Dan was also quoted in the article and a piece Ron had published in the *Minnesota Law Review* was referenced in the article. This report, spearheaded by Vincent N. Schiraldi, was supported in part by a grant from the Laura and John Arnold Foundation. A complete version of this report, including graphs and charts, can be found at the link below.

http://justicelab.iserp.columbia.edu/img/Too_Big_to_Succeed_Report_FINAL.pdf

Introduction

The recent sentencing of Philadelphia rap artist Meek Mill to two to four years in prison for probation violations committed a decade after his original offense has brought the subject of America's expansive community supervision apparatus and its contribution to mass incarceration into the public spotlight (NBC News 2017; Jay-Z 2017).

Founded as either an up-front diversion from incarceration (probation) or a back-end release valve to prison crowding (parole), community corrections in America has grown far beyond what its founders could have imagined with a profound, unintended impact on incarceration. With nearly five million adults under community corrections supervision in America (more than double the number in prison and jail), probation and parole have become a substantial contributor to our nation's mass incarceration dilemma as well as a deprivation of liberty in their own right (Kaeble and Bonczar 2016; Kaeble and Glaze 2016).

The almost fourfold expansion of community corrections since 1980 without a concomitant increase in resources has strained many of the nation's thousands of community supervision departments, rendering some of them too big to succeed, often unnecessarily depriving clients of their liberty without improving public safety (Bureau of Justice Statistics 1995; Kaeble and Bonczar 2016; Pew Center on the States 2009; Klingele 2013; Doherty 2016).

This paper offers a way out of "mass supervision." Authored by leading representatives of our nation's community corrections field, our conclusion is that the number of people on probation and parole nationally can be cut in half over the next decade and returns to incarceration curbed, with savings focused on providing services for those remaining under supervision. This would reduce unnecessary incarceration and supervision, increase the system's legitimacy, and enhance public safety by allowing probation, parole and community programming to be focused on those more in need of supervision and support.

How we got here

When probation (1841) and parole (1876) were created in the U. S. in the 19th Century, they were more focused on rehabilitation, seeking to either steer individuals away from harsher punishments into community supervision, in the case of probation, or to shorten imprisonment in exchange for rehabilitative efforts, in the case of parole (Klinge 2013).

As early as the 1960s, researchers began to question whether community supervision was serving as a true alternative to incarceration or was widening the net of social control.

The advent of mass incarceration in the United States answered that question. Probation and parole populations mushroomed alongside prison and jail populations, signaling that, with some exceptions, community corrections was serving as an add-on, rather than an alternative to, incarceration. From 1980 to its peak in 2007, the number of people under probation (1.1 million to 4.3 million) and parole (220,400 to 826,100) grew almost four-fold (Bureau of Justice Statistics 1995; Kaeble and Bonczar 2016). At the same time, the number of people in prison and jail in the U. S. grew nearly five-fold, from 474,368 to 2.3 million (Kaeble and Glaze 2016).

The number of adults under community supervision has declined from its historic peak by 10% from 2007 to 2015, during which time there was a 14% decline in victimization nationally (Rand 2008; Truman and Morgan 2016). While we do not intend to imply causality in the complex relationship between community supervision and crime, this at least means that it is possible for crime to decline even as the number of those under supervision declines. Also, as arrests have dropped more precipitously (-24%) than the number of adults on probation and parole (-10%), it means that the “probationer-per-arrest” ratio has actually increased (FBI Crime Reports, 2007 and 2015). In the final analysis, an astonishing one out of every 53 adults in America was on probation or parole in 2015 (Kaeble and Bonczar 2016).

Data like these led University of Minnesota researcher Michelle Phelps (2017b) to conclude, “Rather than choosing probation or prison, we have increasingly chosen all of the above, despite sustained declines in crime rates since the 1990s.” Rutgers’ Todd Clear adds, “When we built this large prison system, we bracketed it with enormous . . . community surveillance activities on each end. On the probation side, we built a surveillance and rule structure that almost really nobody could abide by satisfactorily 100% of the time” (Childress 2014).

Workloads increase faster than resources

Despite the system’s enthusiasm for expanding supervision alongside incarceration, policy makers have been reticent to provide concomitant financial support for their community supervision agencies, further stretching already-underfunded parole and probation resources across a growing population.

In 2009, the Pew Charitable Trusts surveyed state corrections and community corrections agencies to discern spending on probation, parole and prisons. Pew found that the cost to incarcerate someone in prison in 2008 was \$79 per day, compared to \$7.47 for a person on parole and \$3.42 for an individual on probation. . . . although there were more than twice as many people on probation and parole as in prison, prisons consumed nearly nine out of every 10 correctional dollars.

The eight states that provided Pew with fiscal data over 25 years showed that the gap between community corrections funding and prisons has dramatically grown over time, at least in those jurisdictions. While twice as many people were added to community corrections from 1983 to 2008, 88% of additional correctional dollars went to prisons compared to only 12% for probation and parole.

These fiscal realities have led policy makers from coast to coast to rely on fees paid by people on probation and parole to bail out shrinking community corrections budgets. The White House Council of Economic Advisers (2015, 4) has cautioned against such practices:

Fines and fees create large financial and human costs, all of which are disproportionately borne by the poor. High fines and fee payments may force the indigent formerly incarcerated to make difficult tradeoffs between paying court debt and other necessary purchases. Unsustainable debt coupled with the threat of incarceration may even encourage some formerly incarcerated individuals to return to criminal activity to pay off their debts, perversely increasing recidivism.

Ron Corbett (2015, 1712), former probation commissioner for Massachusetts, notes:

As the financial penalties incurred by probationers grow, one wonders what those who impose them imagine the financial standing of probationers to be. If it were the case that the average probationer could afford to pay all the costs, fines, and fees that are imposed, there would not have been a crime in the first place, quite possibly.

Get-tough policies impact community corrections

These fiscal shifts occurred simultaneously with a more punitive approach to crime and justice. Probation and parole were swept up in the explosive national growth of imprisonment, the passage of mandatory sentencing and “three strikes” laws, and the increase in sentence lengths. As Corbett (2015, 1707) describes, “. . . no probation administrator could afford to ignore the shifting political winds. Accordingly, probation departments around the country raced to take on the look and feel and accoutrements of a ‘get tough’ agency.”

These accoutrements included increasing numbers of conditions of community supervision, which are estimated at between 10 to 20 conditions per person (Corbett 2015). These can range from fines, fees and restitution; to requirements to abstain from drugs and alcohol; to prohibitions from moving or associating with others with criminal convictions; to work and community service requirements (Doherty 2016). Violations can result in further restrictions, up to and including incarceration.

The growth in the number of conditions has been accompanied by improved technology to surveil people on probation and parole, from electronic monitoring to increased urinalysis testing to negatively impacting credit ratings for failure to pay fines and fees (Corbett 2015; Klinge 2013).

Dan Beto, former director of probation for four counties in Texas and former executive director of the Sam Houston State University Correctional Management Institute, stated:

When I became a probation officer in 1968, offenders placed on probation typically had to adhere to relatively few standard conditions of probation. Over the years we have witnessed the growth in the number of special conditions of probation, and now it is not uncommon for offenders to be saddled with up to a couple of dozen (Corbett 2015, 1708).

Impact of the unfunded growth of community corrections – a perfect storm

Shrinking funds. Mushrooming populations. Better surveillance technology. A more punitive national climate.

These conditions have created a perfect storm for the community corrections field.

Stretched to an average workload of 100 (but often much larger), and charged with improving the lot in life of a population that is frequently poor, homeless, substance abusing, mentally ill and/or unemployed, probation and parole officers are often faced with an impossible task (Phelps and Curry 2017). Charged with assuring public safety in a political environment with low risk tolerance, community corrections personnel have too often resorted to probation and parole revocations and incarceration.

Michael Jacobson, former commissioner of New York City Probation, and his colleagues (2017, 7) wrote:

Few probation agencies have the ability to “step up” people on probation who technically violate (or are at risk of violating) to drug treatment, cognitive behavioral therapy, or employment programs. As a result, probation officers with little to no resources, eager to manage risk and their large caseloads, default to the most available option they have — the most expensive and punitive option — the formal violation process which often results in jail or prison.

From 1990 to 2004, the number of people on probation who were revoked for non-compliance grew by 50%, increasing from 220,000 to 330,000 (Corbett 2015).

According to research by Phelps (2017a), 33% of people in jail and 23% of people in prison in the mid-2000s were on probation at the time of their arrest, a quarter of whom were reincarcerated for nothing more than a technical violation (excluding new arrests). Likewise, 12% of the jail population is comprised of those who were on parole at the time of arrest, as is 18% of the prison population. About one in five of those are incarcerated for technical violations of parole.

Research published by the National Academies of Sciences reports that being under parole supervision may actually be causally related to reincarceration (Harding et al. 2017). Using the random assignment of judges as a natural experiment, the researchers found that post-prison parole supervision increases imprisonment through the detection and punishment of low-level offending or violation behavior.

These punishments fall more heavily on young African American men than on any other population. While one in 53 adults in America is under probation or parole supervision, one in 12 African American males is under community supervision as is nearly one in five young African American males without a high school education (19%) (Phelps 2017a; Phelps and Curry 2017).

In 2014, the Urban Institute researched probation violations by race in four diverse jurisdictions (Dallas County, Texas; Iowa’s Sixth Judicial District (Cedar Rapids); Multnomah County (Portland), Oregon; and New York City) (Jannetta et al. 2014). They found that revocation rates for African American people on probation were higher in all four jurisdictions, even when controlling for relevant characteristics of those on probation.

What to do?

From 2013 to 2016, the Harvard Kennedy School Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management convened 29 individuals from community corrections, prison and jail administration, prosecution, academia, advocacy, philanthropy, elected officials and formerly incarcerated communities to examine the state of community corrections in America. In an extremely unusual move due to the high degree of agreement among the participants, this Executive Session on Community Corrections issued a consensus paper on the future of community corrections, describing five principles that should guide the future of probation and parole:

1. To promote the well-being and safety of communities;
2. To use the capacity to arrest, discipline, and incarcerate parsimoniously;
3. To recognize the worth of justice-involved individuals;
4. To promote the rule of law, respecting the human dignity of people under supervision and treating them as citizens in a democratic society; and
5. To infuse justice and fairness into the system.

In August 2017, the release of another Executive Session paper, *Less is More: How Reducing Probation Populations Can Improve Outcomes* was accompanied by a *Statement on the Future of Community Corrections*. That statement was signed on to by 35 current and former community corrections administrators as well as every major national community corrections organization – the American Probation and Parole Association, the Association of Paroling Authorities International, the Association of State Correctional Administrators, the International Community Corrections Association, the National Association of Pretrial Services Agencies and the National Association of Probation Executives. The group emphasized that, as efforts are made to appropriately size the probation and parole populations, a concurrent effort should be made to match funding to the complexity of the populations that are remaining.

The Statement noted that “community corrections has become a significant contributor to mass incarceration” but that “increasingly sophisticated research has shown that we can responsibly reduce probation and parole populations” and that “it is possible to both significantly reduce the footprint of probation and parole and improve outcomes and public safety.”

Jurisdictions throughout the country have begun to experiment with shrinking the size and negative outcomes of probation and parole, reducing conditions, incentivizing good behavior and curbing revocations.

The Pew Charitable Trusts reports that in 18 of the states (AK, AR, AZ, DE, GA, ID, KS, KY, LA, MD, MO, MS, MT, NH, OR, SC, SD, UT) that have participated in the Justice Reinvestment Initiative (JRI), supervision periods can be shortened by 30 days

for 30 days of compliance, while eight JRI states have shortened probation terms (AK, AL, GA, HI, LA, MT, TX, VT) (Gelb and Utada 2017). Twenty-two JRI states require the use of graduated sanctions and incentives in lieu of revocation and incarceration (AK, AL, AR, DE, GA, ID, KS, KY, LA, MD, MS, MT, NC, ND, NE, NV, PA, SC, SD, TX, UT, WV); while 16 JRI states have put caps on how long individuals can serve for a technical violation of supervision conditions (AK, AL, AR, GA, HI, ID, KS, LA, MD, MO, MS, MT, NC, OK, PA, UT).

In 2012, policy makers in Missouri granted 30 days of earned compliance credit for every 30 days of compliance while under supervision for certain people on probation and parole. From 2012 to 2015, 36,000 people on community supervision were able to reduce their terms by 14 months, reducing caseloads from 70 to 59. There was a 20% reduction in the number of people under supervision, from 73,555 to 58,765, and reconviction rates for those released early were the same as those discharged from supervision before the policy went into effect.

Prior to Arizona policy makers passing the Safe Communities Act, a third of persons admitted to Arizona's prisons had violated conditions of probation. The Act granted earned credits for success on probation, required that judges receive presentence reports using risk and needs assessments and led to evidence based training and hiring practices. From 2008 to 2016, there was a 29% decline in probation violations, a 21% decline in arrests of people on probation, and the state realized \$392 million in averted costs.

From 1996 to 2014, New York City reduced the number of people on probation by about two-thirds (69%) (Jacobson et al 2017; New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services n.d.). Further, the Probation Department enrolled its low-risk clients – around two-thirds of those on probation – in less intrusive supervision that entailed reporting in to an electronic kiosk monthly (Wilson, Naro, and Austin 2007). Finally, city judges, at the department's suggestion, granted early discharge to almost six times as many clients in 2013 as in 2007 (New York City Department of Probation 2013).

During this time period, both crime and incarceration plummeted in the city. Violent crime dropped in New York City by 57% from 1996 to 2014, and the city's jail and prison incarceration rate declined by an equally impressive 55% (New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services n.d.; Holloway and Weinstein 2013; Roche and Deacy 1997; U.S. Census Bureau 2000, 2014; see also Greene and Schiraldi 2016). The low-risk clients checking in at kiosks experienced lower re-arrest rates; so did the higher risk clients who were more closely supervised by probation officers with lower caseloads (Wilson, Naro, and Austin 2007). And those discharged early from probation were less likely to be arrested for a new felony in their first unsupervised year (3%) than those who were on probation for their full term (4.3%) (New York City Department of Probation 2013).

Further, while the Probation Department's budget declined from \$97 million in 2002 to \$73 million in 2016, its expenditures per person on probation actually doubled (controlling for inflation) because so many fewer people were under supervision. This has allowed the department to reduce caseload sizes, increase contracts with nonprofit organizations to provide needed services for its clients, and open neighborhood offices to support and supervise people on probation throughout the city.

Michigan's Community Corrections Act has fiscally incentivized counties since 1988 to improve probation services through a local planning process and reduce the number of people convicted of felonies to state prison (Phelps and Curry 2017). From 1989 to 2010, the commitment rate to prison for new felony offenses in Michigan declined from 35% to 21%, even more remarkable considering the increase in the national commitment rates during that time period.

The California legislature passed and the governor signed into law AB 109 which went into effect on October 1, 2011 (California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation 2013a). Known as Criminal Justice Realignment, AB 109 and other clean up legislation made the following three major changes in criminal justice practice in California:

- People in state prison on non-violent, non-serious, non-sex offense felonies, who would usually be released on state parole, would now be released under the supervision of the county probation department. That supervision could end as early as six months after release, must end after a year if there are no new offenses or violations, and can never be longer than three years.
- People convicted of new non-serious offenses can no longer go to state prison, but can be sent to county jail to serve their sentence.
- People on probation or parole who violate the terms of their supervision can no longer be sent to state prison for that violation but can only go to county jail for a maximum of 180 days which, with a mandatory day-for-day good time credit, normally results in a 90 day maximum stay (there is an exception for the small number of people released on parole who had an original life sentence, a violation of the their parole can result in a return to state prison).

The reforms enacted pursuant to AB 109 have resulted in fewer individuals in state prison and far fewer people under state parole supervision. Overall, according to the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation (CDCR) (2013b), realignment has reduced prison populations in California by 25,000. From the savings generated by this prison population reduction, more than \$1 billion was provided to California counties in 2013-2014.

CDCR found that there was very little difference between the one-year arrest and conviction rates of individuals released pre- and post-realignment, with a slightly lower arrest rate (59% compared to 62%) for the post-realignment group. However, the one-year return-to-prison rate was substantially less post-realignment (7% compared to 42%), which makes sense since realignment significantly limits the circumstances by which someone can be returned to prison on a parole violation.

In 2007, the National Institute of Corrections and the JEHT Foundation asked the Urban Institute to convene two meetings of national community corrections experts to articulate best practices in probation and parole, supervision and revocation (Solomon, Jannetta, et al. 2008; Solomon, Osborne, et al. 2008). The 13 recommendations those experts proffered ranged from frontloading resources and focusing them on the highest risk clients; to incentivizing good behavior through early discharge and using graduated sanctions in lieu of incarceration; to super-

Executive Exchange

vising clients in their home communities and engaging informal social controls; to individually tailoring client services.

Buoyed by examples such as these, *The Statement on the Future of Community Corrections* (Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management 2017), concluded by recommending that the number of people on probation and parole supervision in America be significantly reduced by:

- Reserving the use of community corrections for only those who truly require supervision;
- Reducing lengths of stay under community supervision to only as long as necessary to accomplish the goals of sentencing;
- Exercising parsimony in the use of supervision conditions to no more conditions than required to achieve the objectives of supervision;
- Incentivizing progress on probation and parole by granting early discharge for those who exhibit significant progress;
- Eliminating or significantly curtailing charging supervision fees; and
- Preserving most or all of the savings from reducing probation and parole populations and focusing those resources on improving community based services and supports for people under supervision.

It is now mainstream thought – endorsed by the field’s leading practitioners – that an important aspect of improving community corrections, increasing public safety, and restoring legitimacy will be to substantially downsize the grasp of community corrections by at least half and reduce violations to incarceration so that it can retool itself to focus on helping those most in need of community supports to become the kinds of citizens we all want them to become.

Appendix A: Signatories to “Too Big to Succeed”

Ana Bermudez, Commissioner, New York City Probation

Dan Richard Beto, retired founding Executive Director, Correctional Management Institute of Texas; former Chief Probation Officer for Brazos, Grimes, Madison and Walker Counties, TX; past-President, National Association of Probation Executives

Barbara Broderick, Chief Probation Officer, Maricopa County (Phoenix) Adult Probation, AZ; former state Director, Adult Probation Office, Arizona Supreme Court; former Director, New York State Department of Probation and Correctional Alternatives; past-President, American Probation and Parole Association

Ronald Corbett, former Commissioner, Massachusetts Probation Department; former Executive Director, Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court; past-President, National Association of Probation Executives

Jim Cosby, CEO, JLC Executive Coaching & Consulting; former Director of the National Institute of Corrections; former Assistant Commissioner, Tennessee Department of Correction; former State Director, Tennessee Board of Probation and Parole

Veronica Cunningham, former Chief, Cook County (IL) Adult Probation; former Director, Texas Department of Corrections, Parole

Edward Dolan, Commissioner, Massachusetts Probation Department; former Commissioner, Massachusetts Department of Youth Services; former Executive Director, Massachusetts Parole Board

Marcus M. Hodges, Associate Director, Court Services and Offender Supervision Agency, Washington, DC; President, National Association of Probation Executives

Michael Jacobson, Director, Institute for State and Local Governance, City University of New York (CUNY); Professor, Sociology Department, CUNY Graduate Center; former New York City Probation Commissioner

George M. Keiser, CEO, Keiser and Associates, and former Chief, Community Corrections, National Institute of Corrections

Terri McDonald, Chief Probation Officer, Los Angeles County, CA; former Undersecretary, California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation; former Assistant Sheriff, Los Angeles County

Magdalena Morales-Alina, Director, El Paso County (TX) Community Supervision and Corrections Department

David Muhammad, Executive Director, National Institute for Criminal Justice Reform; former Chief Probation Officer, Alameda County, CA; former Deputy Commissioner, New York City Probation; former Chief of Committed Services, Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services, Washington, DC

Jeffrey L. Peterson, Director of Hearings and Release, Minnesota Department of Corrections - Retired

Vincent N. Schiraldi, Adjunct Professor, Columbia University and Co-Director, Justice Lab; former Commissioner New York City Probation; former Director, Department of Youth Rehabilitation Services, Washington, DC

Wendy Still, Chief Probation Officer, Alameda County (Oakland), CA; former Chief Probation Officer, City and County of San Francisco, CA

Scott Taylor, Director, Multnomah County (OR) Department of Community Justice; former Mayor, Canby, OR; former Assistant Director of Community Corrections, OR Department of Corrections; past President, American Probation and Parole Association

Mary Visek, Chief Probation Officer, Juvenile Probation Office, District 4J, Omaha, NE

Kathy Waters, Director, Adult Probation Services Division, Administrative Office of the Courts, Arizona Supreme Court

Carl Wicklund, Director, Community Justice Division, Volunteers of America – Minnesota; former Executive Director, American Probation and Parole Association; former Court Services Director, Dodge, Fillmore and Olmstead Counties, MN

Appendix B: References

Bureau of Justice Statistics. 1995. *Executive Summary: Correctional Populations in the United States*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Available: www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/Digitization/153849NCJRS.pdf

California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. 2013a. *2011 Public Safety Realignment: The cornerstone of California’s solution to reduce prison overcrowding, costs, and recidivism*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Available: www.cdcr.ca.gov/realignment/docs/Realignment-FactSheet.pdf

- California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. 2013b. *Realignment Report: An Examination of Offenders Released from State Prison in the First Year of Public Safety Realignment*. Sacramento, CA: California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation. Available: www.cdcr.ca.gov/Adult_Research_Branch/Research_Documents/Realignment_1_Year_Report_1223-13.pdf
- Childress, Sarah. 2014, April 29. "Todd Clear: Why America's Mass Incarceration Experiment Failed." *FRONTLINE*. Available: www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/article/todd-clear-why-americas-massincarceration-experiment-failed/
- Council of Economic Advisers. 2015. *Fines, Fees, and Bail: Payments in the Criminal Justice System That Disproportionately Impact the Poor*. Washington, DC: Council of Economic Advisers. Available: https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/page/files/1215_cea_fine_fee_bail_issue_brief.pdf
- Corbett, Ronald P. 2015. "The Burdens of Leniency: The Changing Face of Probation." *Minnesota Law Review* 99(5): 1697-1732. Available: www.minnesotalawreview.org/articles/burdens-leniency-changing-faceprobation/
- Doherty, Fiona. 2016. "Obey All Laws and Be Good: Probation and the Meaning of Recidivism." *Georgetown Law Journal* 104(2): 291-354. Available: <https://georgetownlawjournal.org/articles/26/obey-all-laws-be/pdf>
- Executive Session on Community Corrections. 2017. *Toward an Approach to Community Corrections for the 21st Century: Consensus Document of the Executive Session on Community Corrections*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Kennedy School Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management. Available: www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/centers/wiener/programs/pcj/files/Consensus_Final2.pdf
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. 2016. *2015 Crime in the United States, Persons Arrested*. U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Available: <https://ucr.fbi.gov/ucr-publications>
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. 2008. *2007 Crime in the United States, Persons Arrested*. U.S. Department of Justice, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Available: <https://www2.fbi.gov/ucr/cius2007/arrests/index.html>
- Gelb, Adam, and Connie Utada. 2017. *For Better Results, Cut Correctional Populations*. Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts. Available: www.pewtrusts.org/en/research-and-analysis/analysis/2017/08/25/forbetter-results-cut-correctional-populations
- Greene, Judith A., and Vincent N. Schiraldi. 2016. "Better by half: The New York City story of winning large-scale decarceration while increasing public safety." *Federal Sentencing Reporter* 29(1): 22-38. Available: <http://fsr.ucpress.edu/content/29/1/22>
- Harding, David J., Jeffrey D. Morenoff, Anh P. Nguyen, and Shawn D. Bushway. 2017. "Short- and Long-Term Effects of Imprisonment on Future Felony Convictions and Prison Admissions." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114(42): 11103-11108. Available: www.pnas.org/content/114/42/11103.short?rss=1
- Holloway, Caswell, and Elizabeth Weinstein. 2013. *Mayor's Management Report: Fiscal 2013*. New York, NY: New York City Mayor's Office of Operations. New York, NY: Archives of the Mayor's Press Office. Available: http://www1.nyc.gov/assets/operations/downloads/pdf/mmr2013/2013_mmr.pdf
- Jacobson, Michael P., Vincent Schiraldi, Reagan Daly, and Emily Hotez. 2017. *Less Is More: How Reducing Probation Populations Can Improve Outcomes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Kennedy School Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management. Available: www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/centers/wiener/programs/pcj/files/less_is_more_final.pdf
- Jannetta, Jesse, Justin Breaux, Helen Ho, and Jeremy Porter. 2014. *Examining Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Probation Revocation*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute, www.urban.org/research/publication/examiningracial-and-ethnic-disparities-probation-revocation
- Jay-Z. 2017, November 17. "Jay-Z: The Criminal Justice System Stalks Black People Like Meek Mill." *The New York Times*. Available: <https://www.nytimes.com/2017/11/17/opinion/jay-z-meek-mill-probation.html?r=0>
- Kaeble, Danielle, and Thomas P. Bonczar. 2016. *Probation and Parole in the United States, 2015*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Available: www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/ppus15.pdf
- Kaeble, Danielle, and Lauren Glaze. 2016. *Correctional Populations in the United States, 2015*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Available: www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cpus15.pdf
- Klinge, Cecelia. 2013. "Rethinking the Use of Community Supervision." *Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology* 103(4): 1015-1070. Available: <https://scholarlycommons.law.northwestern.edu/jclc/vol103/iss4/1/>
- NBC News. 2017, November 6. "Rapper Meek Mill Sentenced to 2-4 Years in Prison for Violating Probation." *NBC News*. Available: www.nbcnews.com/pop-culture/music/rapper-meek-mill-sentenced-2-4-yearsprison-violating-probation-n818201
- New York City Department of Probation. 2013. *Do more good: A progress report from the NYC department of probation*. New York, NY: New York City Department of Probation. Available: www.nyc.gov/html/prob/downloads/pdf/dop_progress_report.pdf
- New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. n.d. *Dispositions of adult arrests by county and region, 1996-2014*. New York, NY: New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services. Available: www.criminaljustice.ny.gov/crimnet/ojsa/dispos/index.htm
- Pew Center on the States. 2009. *One in 31: The Long Reach of America Corrections*. Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts. Available: www.pewtrusts.org/~/

[media/assets/2009/03/02/pspp_1in31_report_final_web_32609.pdf](#)

Phelps, Michelle S., and Caitlin Curry. 2017. "Supervision in the Community: Probation and Parole." *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Criminology*, Oxford, England: Oxford University Press. Available: <http://criminology.oxfordre.com/view/10.1093/acrefore/9780190264079.001.0001/acrefore-9780190264079-e-239>

Phelps, Michelle S. 2017a. "Mass Probation and Inequality: Race, Class, and Gender Disparities in Supervision and Revocation." In Jeffery T. Ulmer and Mindy S. Bradley (Eds.), *Handbook on Punishment Decisions: Locations of Disparity* (pp. 1–426). Abingdon, UK: Routledge. Available:

<http://www.asc41.com/dcs/dsc-handbook-volume-2-handbook-on-punishment-decisions-locations-of-disparity-jeffrey-t-ulmer-and-mindy-bradley-editors/>

Phelps, Michelle S. 2017b, July 25. "To Fix the Justice System, Shrink and Reform Community Supervision." In *Justice Today*. Available: <https://injusticetoday.com/to-fix-the-justice-system-shrink-and-reform-community-supervision-f53a0e46f88b>

Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management. 2017. *Statement on the Future of Community Corrections*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Kennedy School Program in Criminal Justice Policy and Management. Available: www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/centers/wiener/programs/pcj/files/statement_on_the_future_of_community_corrections_final.pdf

Rand, Michael R. 2008. *Criminal Victimization, 2007*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Available: www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cv07.pdf

Roche, Colleen, and Jack Deacy. 1997. *Mayor Giuliani releases the mayor's management report: "City is safer, cleaner and stronger economically."* New York, NY: Archives of the Mayor's Press Office. Available: www.nyc.gov/html/om/html/97/spo86-97.html

Solomon, Amy L., Jesse Jannetta, Brian Elderbroom, Laura Winterfield, Jenny W. L. Osborne, Peggy Burke, Richard P. Stroker, Edward E. Rhine, and William D. Burrell. 2008. *Putting Public Safety First: 13 Strategies for Successful Supervision and Reentry*. Washington, DC: The Pew Charitable Trusts. Available: www.pewtrusts.org/~media/assets/2008/12/13strategies.pdf

Solomon, Amy L., Jenny W.L. Osborne, Laura Winterfield, Brian Elderbroom, Peggy Burke, Richard P. Stroker, Edward E. Rhine, and William D. Burrell. 2008. *Putting Public Safety First: 13 Parole Supervision Strategies to Enhance Reentry Outcomes*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Available: www.urban.org/sites/default/files/publication/32156/411791-Putting-Public-Safety-First--ParoleSupervision-Strategies-to-Enhance-Reentry-Outcomes-Paper-.PDF

Truman, Jennifer L., and Rachel E. Morgan. 2016. *Criminal Victimization, 2015*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Available: www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cv15.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau. 2000. *Population estimates for metropolitan areas and components, annual time series April 1, 1990 to July 1, 1999*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, Population Division, Population Estimates Program. Available: www.census.gov/programs-surveys/popest.html

U.S. Census Bureau. 2014. *Annual estimates of the resident population for incorporated places of 50,000 or more, ranked by July 1, 2013 population: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013 - United States -- places of 50,000+ population*. Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau, American FactFinder. Available: <https://factfinder.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?src=bkmk>

Wilson, James A., Wendy Naro, and James F. Austin. 2007. *Innovations in probation: Assessing New York City's automated reporting system*. Washington, DC: The JFA Institute. Available: www.pbpp.pa.gov/Information/Documents/Research/OSR3.pdf

38 LEADERSHIP PRINCIPLES FROM THE GREATEST BUSINESS, MILITARY, POLITICAL AND SPORTS LEADERS

by

Ryan Holiday

It was Eisenhower who said that "leadership is the art of getting someone else to do something you want done because he wants to do it." What he didn't but should have added is that like any art, it's something that has to be studied and practiced. While some of us are born with charisma, few of us come out of the womb a full and cultivated leader. Below are a number of essential lessons on the art of leadership and a framework for the kind of skills required to turn ambition and personality into

something more developed, something deeper. Lessons on how to inspire people, lessons on how to survive crises, lessons on how to treat people, lessons on how to learn. This is by no means a complete list (nor in any sense one that I have mastered myself), but it is a start. Good luck. Being a good leader is a skill that takes a lifetime—so the sooner you start the better.

A Leader Reads — In [his 2013 letter to shareholders](#), Warren Buffett explained that a single book, *The Intelligent Investor*, written by his mentor Benjamin Graham was, “of all the investments I ever made...[it] was the best.” Leaders read. Truman supposedly said, “Not all readers are leaders, but all leaders are readers.” Generalizations are usually worthless, but you can pretty much take this one to the bank.

A Leader is Always Composed — “The first qualification of a general is a cool head,” Napoleon once said. Remaining cool-headed in times of crisis and adversity is one of the most critical skills. The worst that can happen is not the event itself but the event and you losing your cool.

A Leader Places the Mission Above Themselves — During World War II, General George Marshall, winner of the Nobel Peace Prize for the Marshall Plan, was practically offered the command of the troops on D-Day. Yet he told President Roosevelt: “The decision is yours, Mr. President; my wishes have nothing to do with the matter.” It came to be that Eisenhower was selected because FDR preferred to have Marshall with him in Washington. Marshall’s fame as a general was diminished for this selfless decision but his reputation as a leader was cemented for all time. And proof that he was a class act came after, when asked to write the order announcing Eisenhower to the position to the Allied leadership, Marshall did so in longhand first and mailed a copy of it to Eisenhower along with a note congratulating him and [suggesting he keep the document as a memento](#).

A Leader is Generous — You can always recognize a leader by their generosity towards others, particularly the people who work for and with them. Jason Fried, the founder and CEO of Basecamp [has said that](#) he has practically run out of perks to give to his team. From \$5,000 annual vacation stipends to 4-day workweeks in the summer, these gestures have kept his team happy and comfortable (and also happy to be why very few people ever leave the company). When Basecamp does well, its employees do well...and the reverse is also true, which is why leaders must be generous.

A Leader is Humble — Right before he destroyed his own billion-dollar company, Ty Warner, creator of Beanie Babies, overrode the objections of one of his employees and bragged, “I could put the Ty heart on manure and they’d buy it!” A leader [benches the ego](#). A leader never believes they have the Midas touch.

A Leader Stays Sober — Success, money and power can intoxicate a leader. What is required in those moments is sobriety and a refusal to indulge. One look at Angela Merkel, one of the most powerful women on the planet is revealing. She is plain and modest — one writer said that unpretentiousness is Merkel’s main weapon — unlike most world leaders intoxicated with position. Charisma is a crutch. Competence and rationality is a requirement.

A Leader Does The Right Thing, Even If It Holds Them Back — John Boyd, a strategist and leader who revolutionized the way war strategy is taught, [would ask](#) the promising young acolytes under him: “To be or to do? Which way will you go?” As a warrior against bureaucracy in the Pentagon, Boyd knew that telling the truth often held you back from getting promotions, that declining to rubberstamp bad ideas created enemies. He wanted his young officers to do the right thing, even if it held them back. Because if they didn’t, who would?

A Leader Thinks Long Term — Jeff Bezos, the Amazon founder and CEO explained the importance of long term think-

ing two decades ago in [his 1997 letter to shareholders](#). As he said, “We believe that a fundamental measure of our success will be the shareholder value we create over the long term.” For companies—as is the case for individuals—there are always pressures to be myopic and narrow in our focus and vision. Bezos, unlike most business leaders, refused to play that game. As he explained, Amazon will always focus on the long term, “rather than short-term profitability considerations or short-term Wall Street reactions.” He understood that the real value lies in thinking decades ahead. His maxim for business opportunities is also relevant here: “Focus on the things that don’t change.”

A Leader Seizes Opportunities — Leaders don’t wait around for things to happen. Leaders aren’t given their position on a silver platter. No, leaders seize opportunities, no matter how small or disguised those opportunities may be. Think of Amelia Earhart who wanted to be a great aviator. But it was the 1920s, and there were not many opportunities. When a donor was willing to fund the first female transatlantic flight it had a number of insane conditions: She wouldn’t get to fly the plane. There would be a male pilot and co-pilot — they would be paid, she wouldn’t. You know what she said to that offer? She said yes and turned it into something. Less than five years later she was the first woman to fly solo nonstop across the Atlantic and became, rightly, one of the most famous and respected people in the world.

A Leader Actively Seeks Criticism — Dwight D. Eisenhower, one of the best commanders of the last century, has put his views on the necessity of criticism in this way: “I have no sympathy with anyone, whatever his station, who will not brook criticism. We are here to get the best possible results.” As a leader you understand that in any endeavour there is [no room for ego](#)—you answer only to results. And your job is to plan how to achieve those. You actively submit your plans to feedback and criticism —that’s how they get better.

A Leader Sets Rules for Themselves and Their People — Coach Bill Walsh says that “like water, many decent individuals will seek lower ground if left to their own inclinations.” What we need to block these inclinations is rules. Little ones that [we can follow](#) to make us better. This is why relying on rules, constraints and systems is important.

A Leader Gets the Big Things Right — There’s the old Benjamin Franklin line about being a penny wise but a pound foolish. It’s the same thing with leadership. Most people get the little things right and the big things wrong — and then wonder why they don’t get much done.

A Leader Is Prepared for Setbacks — The great Roman Emperor and Stoic philosopher [Marcus Aurelius](#) put it this way: “The art of living is more like wrestling than dancing, because an artful life requires being prepared to meet and withstand sudden and unexpected attacks.”

A Leader Is Objective — The Samurai swordsman Miyamoto Musashi [has stressed](#) the difference between perceiving and observing. The perceiving eye is weak, he wrote, the observing eye is strong. Why? Because leadership requires objectivity and seeing things as they are. It requires us to put aside how our emotions cloud our thinking with fear or brimming overconfidence and see how the situation truly is.

A Leader Knows How to Prioritize — Another great lesson [from Eisenhower is his decision matrix](#) that helps separate and distinguish immediate tasks from important ones. It asks you to group your tasks into a 2x2 grid deciding whether a task

is either important or not and whether it is urgent. Most of us are distracted by what's happening right now – even though it doesn't matter – and as a result neglect what is critical but far in the future.

A Leader Makes Things Better — Chris Hadfield, the astronaut, [reminds us that](#) there is “no problem so bad that we can't make it worse” (and panicking is often a way to do that). Yet how many of us have had bosses we didn't want to keep informed about problems because if we did, they'd only make solving them harder? Leaders have to be a source of good energy and solutions. They can't make hard things harder – they need to make hard things easier for their employees or followers. That's the job.

A Leader Cultivates Their Will — When Antonio Pigafetta, the assistant to Magellan on his trip around the world, reflected on his boss's greatest and most admirable skill, what do you think he said? It had nothing to do with sailing. The secret to his success, Pigafetta said, was Magellan's ability to endure hunger better than the other men. There are far more failures in the world due to a collapse of will than there will ever be from objectively conclusive external events.

A Leader Keeps the Morale High — There is a well-known remark from Napoleon: “The moral is to the physical as three to one.” Or in a more modern take, how Colin Powell put it: “Perpetual optimism is a force multiplier.” Optimism and high morale multiply the effectiveness of everything else – it is why they are key levers that need to be considered in any operation.

A Leader Is Not Passionate — A young basketball player named Lewis Alcindor, Jr., who won three national championships with John Wooden at UCLA, used one word to describe the style of his famous coach: “dispassionate.” As in not passionate. Wooden wasn't about rah-rah speeches or screaming from the sidelines. He saw those extra emotions [as a burden](#). Instead, his philosophy was about being in control and doing your job and never being “passion's slave.” The player who learned that lesson from Wooden would later change his name to one you remember better: Kareem Abdul-Jabbar.

A Leader Knows How to Manage and Delegate — When Eisenhower entered the White House for the first time as president and walked into the Executive Mansion, his chief usher handed him two letters marked “Confidential and Secret” that had been sent to him earlier in the day. Eisenhower's reaction was swift: “Never bring me a sealed envelope,” [he said firmly](#). “That's what I have a staff for.” As his chief of staff later put it, “The president does the most important things. I do the next most important things.”

A Leader is Rarely Caught Off Guard — General Matthew Ridgway had the following motto behind his desk: “The only inexcusable offense in a commanding officer is to be surprised.” As a leader, your job is to see the bigger picture and the potential perturbations in what you set out to do. Things never go according to plan – be ready and on guard for whatever comes your way.

A Leader Is A Learner — As [one biographer would observe](#) of Genghis Khan, “At no single, crucial moment in his life did he suddenly acquire his genius at warfare, his ability to inspire the loyalty of his followers, or his unprecedented skill for organizing on a global scale. These derived not from epiphanic enlightenment or formal schooling but from a persistent cycle of pragmatic learning, experimental adaptation and constant revision driven by his uniquely disciplined mind and focused will.”

A Leader Is Always Ready for Chaos — As [the legendary coach Phil Jackson would explain](#), “Once I had the Bulls practice in silence; on another occasion I made them scrimmage with the lights out. Not because I want to make their lives miserable but because I want to prepare them for the inevitable chaos that occurs the minute they step onto a basketball court.”

A Leader Knows How To Manage (Themselves and Others) — John DeLorean was a brilliant engineer but a poor manager (of people and himself). One executive described his management style as “chasing colored balloons” – he was constantly distracted and abandoning one project for another. It's just not enough to be smart or right or a genius. It's gratifying to be the micromanaging egotistical boss at the center of everything – but that's not how organizations grow and succeed. That's not how you can grow as a leader either.

A Leader Has a Guiding Philosophy — Seahawks coach Pete Carroll is known for his [‘Win Forever’ philosophy](#) – the winning mindset he aims to instill in his staff and players. Similarly, the great coach Wooden has his own [‘Pyramid of Success.’](#) (In fact, Pete Carroll [was inspired by Wooden](#) to create his own philosophy of winning.) These philosophies and frameworks are critical as they codify the principles and rules by which a team will make decisions and operate on a day-to-day basis. If you don't have a philosophy, how do you expect to know what to do in tough situations? Or when things are confusing or complicated? Being reactive is never a position of strength. It is not a position a leader should find themselves in.

A Leader Is Driven — Roger Bannister, the first person to run a mile under four minutes knew a thing or two about that philosophy and summed it up as: “The man who can drive himself further once the effort gets painful is the man who will win.” The leader is the driver of the organization. They have to have the ambition, the motivation – to change the world, to be successful, to win – that the rest of the organization defers to. Without a driven leader, the cause has no engine.

A Leader Sets The Why — What was Hillary Clinton's big mistake? It wasn't declining to campaign in this state or that one, it wasn't her email server. It was that she had no real compelling reason why she was running for president. She just sort of wanted it. No one tries hard or dedicates themselves to a cause without a strong why, without a deep, emotional resonance with the purpose of the organization. A leader has to find their why and they have to build it into their company, business or campaign from day one.

A Leader Looks for Themselves — Samuel Zemurray's line – [per the excellent Rich Cohen](#) – was “Never trust the report.” He went to South America or Boston or wherever the business was being done and saw the situation for himself. He wanted first hand knowledge so as a leader he could make the right decisions. A leader can't simply accept whatever trickles up from below them – they have to see for themselves. Not all the time – but most of the time.

A Leader Sets High Standards — Football coach Bill Walsh took the 49ers from the worst team in the league to Super Bowl champions in just three years. How? He created a culture of excellence and instilled what he called his “Standard of Performance.” That is: How to practice. How to dress. How to hold the ball. Where to be on a play down to the very inch. Which skills mattered for each position. He knew that by upholding these standards, [“the score would take care of itself.”](#)

A Leader Kills Their Pride — “Whom the gods wish to destroy,” Cyril Connolly wrote, “they first call promising.” As a leader, you cannot let pride lead you astray. You must remind yourself everyday how much work is left to be done, not how much you have done. You must remember that humility is the antidote to pride.

A Leader Is Patient — [Robert Greene](#), the bestselling author of *48 Laws of Power*, published his first book at age 39. It didn't hit the New York Times Bestseller list until more than a decade later. When you get impatient, think about Robert's journey. Think about a head coach who spent 20 years as an assistant for dozens of teams before they got their shot. Remind yourself that the next level might require waiting that long, that you need to be patient. That things take time. Things that rush into this world are often rushed right out. Play the long game.

A Leader Doesn't Assume They Know Everything — “It is impossible to learn that which one thinks one already knows,” [Epictetus](#) says. When a leader lets their ego tell them that they have arrived and figured it all out, it prevents them from learning and it leads to mistake. A leader must be like Socrates — willing to admit how little they know and dedicate themselves to exposing and addressing this ignorance wherever it is.

A Leader Is Pragmatic — When the mogul Sam Zemurray, at the time still a relatively unknown entrepreneur, was told he couldn't build a bridge he desperately needed — because government officials had been bribed by competitors to make bridges illegal — Zemurray had his engineers build two long piers instead. And in between which reached out far into the center of the river, they strung a temporary pontoon that could be assembled and deployed to connect them in a matter of hours. Railroads ran down each side of the riverbank, going in opposite direction. When his competitor complained, Zemurray laughed and replied: “Why, that's no bridge. It's just a couple of little old wharfs.” A leader knows that there are many ways to get from point A to point B. Don't worry about the “right” way, worry about the right way. This is how leaders get things done.

A Leader Knows How to Say 'No' — A leader pursues what [the philosopher Seneca](#) refers to as *euthymia* — the tranquility of [knowing what you are after](#) and not being distracted by others. You accomplish this by having an honest conversation with yourself and understanding your priorities. And rejecting all the rest. Learning how to say no is one of leadership's most essential tenets.

A Leader Keeps an Inner Scorecard — Just because you won doesn't mean you deserved to. A leader needs to forget other people's validation and external markers of success. Warren Buffett has advised keeping an inner scorecard versus the external one. Your potential, the absolute best you're capable of — that's [the metric to measure yourself against](#).

A Leader Persists — A leader knows that an obstacle standing in their way [isn't going anywhere on its own](#). They're not going to outthink it or out create it with some world-changing epiphany. You've got to look at it and the people around you, who have begun their inevitable chorus of doubts and excuses,

and say, as Margaret Thatcher famously did: “You turn if you want to. The lady's not for turning.” A leader knows that genius often really is just persistence in disguise.

A Leader Uses What's Around Them — Booker T. Washington's story [is inspiring and remarkable](#) — only sixteen years old, hearing about a school in Virginia, Washington traveled 500 miles, often on foot, and sleeping under a raised sidewalk along the way to make it there. He showed up without a recommendation or even an appointment. Without waiting, he picked up a broom and swept the room immaculately clean, impressing a teacher who remarked “I guess you will do to enter this institution.” He would later on become one of America's most prominent civil rights leaders and someone worth studying and emulating. As [one of his favorite lessons go](#), “Cast down your bucket where you are.”

A Leader Has Courage — Eleanor Roosevelt [wrote that](#) “You gain strength, courage and confidence by every experience in which you really stop to look fear in the face. You are able to say to yourself, ‘I have lived through this horror. I can take the next thing that comes along.’ . . . You must do the thing you think you cannot do.” Her husband's affairs and his capricious ego. The early death of her beloved father. Being sent away to boarding school. The long wars her country fought in. A life of often thankless public service. Eleanor was not fearless — she just persevered through these things despite that fear.

You'll notice there is very little negative or Machiavellian in this list. That's on purpose. No one would deny that there is an element of raw power to effective leadership, and it's not always a pleasant business. But the most effective leadership strategies are far less dramatic or ruthless. Simply, leaders lead. By example. By embodying the principles they want others to follow. Mostly, they earn their position by being the kind of person other people admire and respect.

So if you want to be a leader, start with that.

Editor's Note: I'd like to thank Ryan for graciously allowing *Executive Exchange* to reprint his piece on leadership which originally ran in [Thought Catalog](#).

Ryan Holiday is a writer and media strategist. He is the former director of marketing for American Apparel and through his creative agency, [Brass Check](#), has advised clients like Google, TASER, and Complex, as well as many prominent bestselling authors, including John Grisham, Neil Strauss, Tony Robbins, and Tim Ferriss. Ryan is the author of six books, including [The Obstacle Is the Way](#), [Ego Is the Enemy](#), [The Daily Stoic](#), and [Perennial Seller](#). *The Obstacle Is the Way* has been translated into more than twenty languages and has a cult following among NFL coaches, world-class athletes, TV personalities, political leaders, and others around the world. He lives on a ranch outside Austin, Texas. You can learn more about Ryan and his work at his [website](#).



INTEGRATED OFFENDER MONITORING SOLUTIONS

Track Group is proud to offer the most advanced portfolio of monitoring and analytics solutions designed to increase public safety by improving the management of offenders, while enhancing rehabilitation outcomes.

TRACK
GROUP

trackgrp.com

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: Todd Jermstad, J. D., Director of the Bell/Lampasas Counties Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Belton, Texas, and a member of the Board of Directors of the National Association of Probation Executives; 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; Donald G. Evans, a Senior Fellow with the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario, a Contributing Editor for *Executive Exchange*, and a former President of the American Probation and Parole Association and the International Community Corrections Association; and Jaime Tilston, Gender Responsive Care Manager at the John Howard Society of Toronto, Ontario.

**UNFORESEEN CONSEQUENCES – HOW
MASS INCARCERATION WAS UNWITTINGLY
AIDED BY THOSE WITH THE BEST INTENTIONS
FOR BLACK AMERICANS**

Review of Locking Up Our Own: Crime and Punishment in Black America, by James Forman, Jr. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2017, 320 pp., \$27.00 (hardback).

James Forman, Jr., is Professor of Law at Yale University. Prior to joining the faculty at Yale Law School he was on the faculty at Georgetown Law School. However the most important job experience that he undoubtedly had was after clerking for Justice Sandra Day O'Connor on the United States Supreme Court he became a public defender with the Public Defender Service in Washington, D. C. In this capacity he represented both juveniles and adults charged with various criminal offenses, some very serious, and saw firsthand the way that persons, especially minorities, were processed through a system to produce results that had less to do with rehabilitation than to condemn these individuals to a life of poverty, diminished human potential, and repeated re-offending. The fact that most of those involved in the system, including judges, prosecutors, and law enforcement, were African-American added more than irony to this situation.

Locking Up Our Own: Crime and Punishment in Black America explores the origin of mass incarceration through the perspective of black participants in the criminal justice system. The author's primary focus is on the history of the criminal justice system in one predominate African-American city, Washington, D. C., over the last forty years. He explains that actions taken over these four decades by participants in the criminal justice system, often by people committed to the civil rights movement and equality for all citizens, unwittingly contributed to the phenomena in the United States of mass incarceration and the disproportionate confinement of minorities, especially African-Americans.

This book consists of six chapters, an introduction, and an epilogue. Each chapter takes a period of history in Washington, D. C., examines the prevalence of crime during this period, and explains what steps were taken to curb the crime rate. The primary focus of these chapters examines an increasing reliance on a war on drug beginning around 1975 and the resulting mass incarceration of minority offenders. These chapters also examine the integration and eventual control of law enforcement, the courts, and prosecution in this majority black city by African-Americans and the policies and responses these new decision-makers made to deal with crime in their city.

The introduction lays out the principle arguments of the author, who wants to answer one basic question – “How did a majority-black jurisdiction end up incarcerating so many of its own?” Professor Forman acknowledges that to answer this question, one must start with a profound social fact: In the years preceding and during our punishment binge, black communities were devastated by historically unprecedented levels of crime and violence. Moreover, the author notes that African-Americans have always viewed the protection of black lives as a civil rights issue, whether the threat came from police officers or street criminals. In addition, the author affirms that racism shaped the political, economic, and legal context in which the black community and its elected representatives made their choices. Finally, one of the major explanations for the phenomena of mass incarceration in a majority-black jurisdiction that the author presents is that the War on Drugs was waged in an incremental and diffused way that made it difficult for some African-American leaders to appreciate the impact of the choices that they were making.

The author notes that starting after the end of the Second World War, urban cities began to see the first if tentative steps toward integrating local police forces. Advocates of civil rights saw the hiring of black police officers as a major achievement in racial equality. However, Professor Forman also notes that there was a class distinction in the integration of police departments that caused friction among different black groups. The author observes that those who fought for the hiring of black police officers occupied one stratum of black society while those who actually became police officers occupied another. Thus, he states that “blacks who joined police departments had a far more complicated set of attitudes, motivations, and incentives than those pushing for black police had assumed.”

It was an unfortunate set of circumstances that when the goals of the civil rights were being achieved in the 1960s, the crime rate in urban setting was also rising dramatically. This meant that when a generation of black leaders began to occupy meaningful positions in city government, the courts, and local law enforcement, they had to make serious policy decisions to address crime, violence, and the proliferation of drugs, especially heroin. There was a strong demand in black communities for their leaders to do something about the rise in crime rates. Black officials in turn responded to their constituents by showing no tolerance for drugs and taking a strong law enforcement stand.

Professor Forman notes that in the 1970s the Washington, D. C., city council opposed any efforts to lessen the penalties for marijuana while responding to gun use by prohibiting the ownership of guns by citizens living in the city. These policies did

not diminish the use or possession of either guns or marijuana but instead served as a net for arresting, prosecuting, and sentencing more minority offenders. Professor Forman concludes his chapter on the 1970s by observing that in both the marijuana and gun control debate, elected officials and other community leaders identified an issue plaguing the community, focused on its racial dimensions, and lead a political response that emphasized prohibition.

In Washington, D. C., as in many other urban areas, the 1980s saw another rise in drug use, violence, and crime. This time the drug causing this misery was crack cocaine. For several years, the murder rate continued to set new records. Legislatively, the response was to establish new mandatory minimum sentences. On the law enforcement side the response was to create warrior policing. As the author notes, the fight against crack cocaine helped to enshrine the notion that police must be warriors – aggressive and armored – working the ghetto corners as an army might patrol enemy territory. One especially detrimental result of warrior policing was that the police came to regard most neighborhood residents, and young people in particular, with generalized suspicion. Thus the author notes that “unable to distinguish between a student on break and a drug dealer working the corner, the police treated them both as menaces to public safety.”

The author states that it was not until the early and mid-1990s that black attitudes toward the War on Drugs and the consequences of aggressive policing and large groups of primarily men being taken from communities and incarcerated for longer periods to time began to be seriously re-examined. He notes that from the late 1960s through the late 1980s much of black America had remained committed to the War on Drugs, even supporting mandatory minimum sentences. However, by the 1990s it became apparent, not only to those in the black community or advocates for black interests but also for those interested in criminal justice reforms, that mass incarceration had wrecked havoc on untold black lives and from a social policy standpoint had been extremely counter-productive. Thus by the beginning of the 2000s advocates from a broad spectrum of the political landscape began to seriously question our nation’s approach to criminal justice for the last forty years and to propose solutions to address the overreliance on incarceration in this country. These reform efforts continue to this day.

In the epilogue to his book, Professor Forman makes several observations about the current state of criminal justice reform efforts in our country. These observations provide both support and a critique of the reform efforts over the last decade and a half. The first observation, which he also mentioned earlier in his book, is that the phenomena of mass incarceration is the result of a series of “small decisions, made over time, by a disparate group of actors.” He notes that if his observation is correct, then mass incarceration will likely have to be undone in the same way. This supports recent reform efforts in which advocates of reform focus on cautious and often minimal changes that garner broad political support instead of advocating for sweeping changes to penal laws or sentencing practices.

The second observation, which is a critique of recent reform efforts, notes that advocates for criminal justice reform increasingly separate “nonviolent drug offenders” from “violent criminals.” He bases his critique on two points. One is that even if society decided today to unlock the prison door of every single

American behind bars on a drug offense, we would still have a country that had the world’s largest prison population. His second basis for criticizing this approach to criminal justice reform is that by separating the nonviolent drug offenders from violent criminals we define one group of offenders as worthy of compassion and a chance to redeem themselves and a second group of offenders as deserving what they get.

James Forman’s book has gotten a great deal of positive attention since its publication. I first became aware of this book while listening to a fascinating interview of him on *All Things Considered* on National Public Radio on April 18, 2017, while driving home after work. See <https://www.npr.org/2017/04/18/524569143/locking-up-our-own-details-the-mass-incarceration-of-black-men>. Indeed, the book was nominated for the National Book Award in 2017 and has been named a Best Book of the Year by the *New York Times*, *The Marshall Project*, *Publisher’s Weekly*, and *GQ Magazine*.

In the Winter 2015 issue of *Executive Exchange*, I reviewed three books addressing the issue of race and mass incarceration. One of the books was Michelle Alexander’s seminal *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Colorblindness*. At the time that I read this book, the matter that plagued me the most was how could so many people of good will and advocates for equality and civil rights have supported policies that led to the outcomes described by Professor Alexander.

James Forman provides an answer to this question. In hindsight the outcome seems glaringly obvious. However, when looking at the time these decisions and policies were made, the eventual outcome was not so obvious. Moreover, in order to understand why certain policies were chosen over others, one must understand the circumstances (and constraints) at the time, the sentiment of the constituents of local elected officials, and the expected outcome of the policies adopted and implemented. Many of the policies implemented at the time that reformers have come to regret were advocated during a period of rising crime being driven primarily by drug epidemics. The policies were an attempt to reduce the level of violence and drugs by removing the few bad apples and drug dealers while protecting the rest of the community. No one at the time foresaw that police strategies, legislatively tougher sentencing laws, and practices by the courts and prosecutors would sweep large numbers of minority males into a system from which they could never extricate themselves.

Locking Up Our Own: Crime and Punishment in Black America serves as a cautionary tale for future policy makers of good intentions gone awry, of local officials reacting to immediate problems without considering the long-term implications, and advocates of reform promoting the advancement of civil rights but failing to advocate for changes to the culture, structure, and practices of recently integrated institutions. However, understanding how this situation occurred makes those who see only with hindsight better sympathize with those who were expected to address serious societal matters that arose at the same time that civil rights were being secured for African-Americans. Unfortunately, mass incarceration took forty years to be fully implemented and it may take as long to be disassembled.

Todd Jermstad, J. D.

THE INEQUITIES OF PREDATORY PRACTICES AND CASH REGISTER JUSTICE

Review of Not a Crime to be Poor: The Criminalization of Poverty in America, by Peter Edelman. New York: The New Press, 2017, 293 pp., \$26.95 (hardback).

According to an impressive biographical sketch appearing on the Georgetown University Law Center's website, Peter Edelman, the author of *Not a Crime to be Poor: The Criminalization of Poverty in America*, is the Carmack Waterhouse Professor of Law and Public Policy and the Faculty Director of the Center on Poverty and Inequality. Professor Edelman, who earned a bachelor's degree and an LL.B. degree from Harvard, has been on the faculty of Georgetown Law since 1982. Early during the Clinton administration he was Counselor to Donna Shalala, Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services, and later was Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation. Other commendable work experience includes serving as Director of the New York State Division for Youth and Vice President of the University of Massachusetts. In addition, he was a Legislative Assistant to Senator Robert F. Kennedy and was Issues Director for the 1980 presidential campaign of Senator Edward M. Kennedy. Earlier in his career he was a Law Clerk for Judge Henry J. Friendly of the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit and later for Supreme Court Justice Arthur J. Goldberg. He was also employed by the U. S. Department of Justice as Special Assistant to Assistant Attorney General John Douglas. Professor Edelman has made significant contribution to the literature on a variety of social and legal issues, including his earlier book *So Rich, So Poor: Why It's So Hard to End Poverty in America*.

In the introduction of *Not a Crime to be Poor*, Professor Edelman sets the tone of the book when he writes about abusive practices in our criminal justice system and their impact on those struggling to eke out an existence as follows:

Beyond mass incarceration, beginning in the 1990s we adopted a new set of criminal justice strategies that further punished poor people for their poverty. Low-income people are arrested for minor violations that are only annoyances for people with means but are disastrous for the poor and near poor because of the high fines and fees we now almost routinely impose. Poor people are held in jail to await trial when they cannot afford bail, fined excessive amounts, and hit with continuously mounting costs and fees. Failure to pay begets more jail time, more debts from accumulated interest charges, additional fines and fees, and, in a common penalty with significant consequences for those living below or near the poverty line, repeated driver's license suspensions. Poor people lose their liberty and often lose their jobs, are frequently barred from a host of public benefits, may lose custody of their children, and may even lose their right to vote. . . . Many debtors will carry debts to their deaths, often hounded by bill collectors and new prosecutions.

The book is divided into two parts. In the first part, entitled "The Criminalization of Poverty" and consisting of eight chapters, the author describes practices akin to a "system of modern peonage" and "cash register justice."

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 Brian Mirasolo, Editor of *Executive Exchange*, at bmirasolo@gmail.com:

Specific questions concerning *Executive Exchange* may be directed to Brian Mirasolo at (617) 909-3102 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.

Executive Exchange

In the book's first chapter – “Ferguson Is Everywhere: Twenty-First-Century Debtors’ Prisons” – Professor Edelman provides an overview of how offenders – mostly minor offenders and African American – are financially exploited by criminal justice systems throughout the United States that exist by extracting limited financial resources from those who can least afford it. The second chapter – “Fighting Back: The Advocates and Their Work” – provides examples of attempts to combat and reform abusive practices, such as delayed initial appearances, outrageously excessive fines and fees, reliance on predatory private probation companies, suspension of driver’s licenses for failure to pay court imposed assessments, and oppressively high bail requirements. Continuing on the bail theme, chapter three is devoted to cash bail requirements and the need for reform, which we are now witnessing in a number of jurisdictions.

“The Criminalization of Mental Illness” is the focus of the fourth chapter, in which the author describes the abuse of the mentally ill and the chemically dependent in the criminal justice system and the need for reform, moving them from a punitive system to one where treatment is emphasized. Professor Edelman recognizes the difficulties in institutionalizing reform and creating a fundamental change in the system’s culture when he writes:

There is no magic way to accomplish either prison reform or improvement in services for the mentally ill or treatment for those with addictions (often the same people). What gets fixed often gets unfixed after a while. In some states, a governor or legislative leader or even a progressive corrections commissioner will lead the way to change, but governors and legislators and commissioners come and go. Outsiders – lawyers, other advocates, and journalists – are more often the catalyst for change and must be the force for keeping it, once achieved. But it must be noted that, all along, there are caring and courageous mental health professionals who stay at it day after day and press for change whenever they can get a hearing.

In the fifth chapter – “Child Support: Criminalizing Poor Fathers” – Professor Edelman examines the criminal justice system’s efforts to collect child support from mostly indigent fathers. “Criminalizing Public Benefits” is the title of next chapter, in which is described how eligibility of certain benefits for the needy – welfare, unemployment insurance, housing, employment, and education and training – are withheld from persons in the criminal justice system. Chapter seven – “Poverty, Race, and Discipline in Schools: Go Directly to Jail” – provides an overview of practices in certain American schools that promote the “school-to-prison pipeline,” such as sending misbehaving children to adult courts and criminalizing truancy. In this chapter the author cites Texas and Georgia for their reform efforts in this area.

Chapter eight is devoted to such topics as crime-free housing ordinances, government efforts at deterring desegregation, and the criminalization of homelessness, described by former Attorney General Eric Holder as “costly, unjust, and not a solution to homelessness.” Professor Edelman concludes this chapter with the following words of caution:

After eight years of strong support from Washington, we have a man running the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Ben Carson, who knows absolutely nothing about the importance of the agency he heads. The challenge for the cities that are pushing ahead to create more housing and decriminalize homelessness is to sustain their momentum until a better day. We shall see.

Found in the two chapters in the book’s second part – “Ending Poverty” – is Professor Edelman’s vision for reform. He begins Chapter nine – “Taking Criminal Justice Reform Seriously” – with the following observation:

Mass incarceration was and still is about race, but it is also about poverty, and especially race and poverty combined. The people locked up have always been disproportionately poor and of color, and for the most part their incarceration has ensured that they would stay poor for the rest of their lives.

This chapter provides a brief history of America’s failed experiment with mass incarceration and describes efforts in some jurisdictions to ease the plight of those with criminal records, such as expungement and decarceration. Highlighted in this chapter are the work of individuals in Pennsylvania, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, and California to bring about positive change in their jurisdictions.

In the final chapter – “Turning the Coin Over: Ending Poverty as We Know It” – Professor Edelman offers his ambitiously hopeful thoughts on what must be done to bring about an end to poverty and to stem the tide of mass incarceration:

We have to turn the coin over and provide prenatal care for all, child development for all children, first-class education for all, decent jobs and effective work supports, affordable housing, health and mental health, lawyers as needed, safe neighborhoods, on violence on the streets or at home, healthy communities, economic, social, racial and gender justice, and justice rather than charity. One can add to the list and elaborate the items mentioned. We want all of this for many reasons, among them that it will reduce the number of people who get locked up.

A number of initiatives throughout the United States that are making some progress in instituting much needed reform are identified in this final chapter.

In *Not a Crime to be Poor: The Criminalization of Poverty in America*, Peter Edelman has placed a clear and critical eye on our criminal justice system, and has found it to be severely wanting. This is an excellent book and an easy read, for which the author is to be commended. Unfortunately, considering the fractious climate and childish behavior currently found in Washington, it is unlikely that meaningful reforms will find support or a champion in the federal government. If reform is to be achieved, it will come from those few leaders at the local level and then replicated elsewhere.

Dan Richard Beto

THE IMPACT OF PARENTAL INCARCERATION ON CHILDREN'S LIFE CHANCES

Review of Children of the Prison Boom: Mass Incarceration and the Future of American Inequality, by Sara Wakefield and Christopher Wildeman. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014, 230 pp., \$26.95 (paperback).

For more than a decade there has been a flurry of journal and mass media articles as well as books by academics and journalists offering explanations of how and why America became known for leading the world in imprisoning its citizens. A number of these accounts discuss the failure of the “tough-on-crime” approach and the war on drugs, while others concentrate on the social consequences of mass incarceration. Lately research is noting the impact of mass incarceration on workforce participation rates and in increasing income insecurity, inequality, and racial disparity. As this mass incarceration literature has grown, so have the approaches and sites of investigation examined by researchers. These investigative sites include exploring mass incarceration’s impact on employment, mental health, and the success or lack of success of released prisoners returning to the community. The authors of this book, Sara Wakefield, an associate professor of criminal justice at Rutgers University, and Christopher Wildeman, an associate professor of policy analysis and management at Cornell University, have given us much to think about in this informative and readable discussion and explanation of their findings into the impact of parental incarceration on children and the eventual impact of the future of American inequality.

The book comprises eight chapters and a very helpful methodological appendix with extensive notes and references that will assist readers seeking to explore further the issues addressed in this study. In the introduction the authors point out that this book is about children who at some point in their lives have experienced the incarceration of a parent during the period following the 1970s and the commencement of the increase in prison populations. These experiences by the children have two general outcomes; in some cases a few are motivated to do better in their lives and in other cases, generally the majority, it results in adverse consequences that “ripple from infancy throughout childhood and even adulthood.” Their book is also about how mass incarceration “has transformed racial inequality among children,” creating serious implications for the future of inequality in the United States. The authors provide a brief background to their study by discussing macro-level change and its impact on childhood inequality by noting how economic shifts such as the “great recession” and the subsequent increase in unemployment became problematic for the children. They write: “The influence of parental circumstances on the lives of children is apparent not only in differences between birth cohorts but also in long standing racial disparities in health, educational and occupational attainment and well-being.” The aim of their research is to examine the implications of parental imprisonment on the welfare of children; they note that this exploration is particularly critical today “because, contrary to earlier periods in American history, millions of children now experience it.” The authors provide us with a snapshot of mass imprisonment by defining it not only in terms of the volume of citizens incarcerated but also the racial disparity that has occurred. They comment on the

suggested link between imprisonment and crime reduction and note that the impact of this reduction effect is much smaller than claimed by “get tough advocates.”

In the chapters that follow the authors build their case regarding the long-term implications of mass incarceration on inequality by demonstrating how it affects children and especially to the unique risks faced by African American children who have a greater chance of enduring the imprisonment of their fathers. Their findings are the result of a blend of quantitative and qualitative evidence that enable them to explore three areas where paternal imprisonment appeared to have causal effect: mental health and behavioral problems, infant mortality, and child homelessness. In all of these three categories the authors found a robust association with paternal incarceration.

In chapter seven the professors continue their investigation by examining the question of mass imprisonment’s contribution to childhood inequality. In reviewing the results of their analysis the authors noted that there was a clear distinction concerning black-white inequality among adult men. The experience of prison has become common for black men and the findings noted that between 20-25 percent of black men can expect to experience a prison sentence by their early thirties. The authors state that this experience affects well-being in a number of domains especially in income security and heightens the risk of divorce. Their findings support a claim that paternal incarceration does do harm to children with the exception of abusive fathers. They also found that “effects on black-white disparities in childhood inequality were far greater than the effects on adult inequality.” Wakefield and Wildeman state: “The prolonged absence of a father due to imprisonment has become common for recent generations of black children – especially those whose fathers dropped out of high school.” They make a strong argument for the need to recognize that “paternal incarceration can exacerbate racial inequalities in children’s well-being and development.” It is their opinion that we can no longer “ignore the relevance of the penal system for black children” who have been born in the last two decades.

This is a well written and clear exposition of research conducted to examine the neglected aspect of the consequences of mass incarceration and although the findings are both disturbing and dismaying the researchers believe that there are solutions that can make the future look less bleak. What they suggest is broader social welfare interventions and much narrower criminal justice interventions. They clearly state that even though imprisonment is at the center of the problem, the “solutions are not found in the criminal justice system.” Wakefield and Wildeman suggest the following:

Investment in education, social welfare, drug treatment, job training programs for all children;

Broad-based social interventions for disadvantaged children;

Investment in crime-reduction programs; and

Redirect crime-control and punishment efforts towards the most violent offenders.

What is clear from their suggestions is that they are convinced that the solutions to reducing the inequality for children now and in the future must take place outside of the criminal justice system and will require significant investing in the communities most affected. The authors close their timely book with a reminder that “without substantial public investment in these communities, it is unlikely that the long-term consequences of mass imprisonment will be undone, and the crushing poverty and lack of opportunity of today will be transformed into another generation of children of the prison boom.” For those of us who are both interested in and committed to advocating and working for safer and healthier communities, this book is an important read.

Donald G. Evans

SUSTAINABLE CHANGE REQUIRES RESPECT AND AUTONOMY

Review of Motivational Interviewing with Offenders: Engagement, Rehabilitation, and Reentry, by Jill D. Stinson and Michael D. Clark. New York: The Guilford Press, 2017, 264 pp., \$27.00 (paperback).

As recidivism rates continue to be evermore concerning, it is time to place greater weight and attention on effective techniques that elicit long term behavioral change. Gone should be the days where the focus is on simply getting an offender to the completion of his or her sentence. As a practitioner supporting the prison-to-community transition of federal offenders, it is refreshing to read a book, directed at the criminally involved, that offers such a clear outline as to how we can address offender behavior and bring about lasting change.

Parole and probation focus heavily on blanket type conditions and compliance, however all too often lack an instrument of change. As pointed out by the authors, with this practice, “an offender will comply only so long as he or she is being closely monitored.” While an offender may successfully reach the end of their sentence while living under a microscope, without active transformational guidance, we often see compliance without behavior change. While this can be seen as a community corrections “success,” this is a failure to the offender and our communities.

Stinson and Clark tap into the intrinsic motivation that exists in everyone to improve themselves. Using practical and clear examples, tables and charts, they outline how to facilitate behavior change. The book epitomizes the essential guide to exploring and nurturing that motivation. Stemming from the predominantly punitive 1980s, motivational interviewing (MI) was introduced to the criminal justice system as an individualized process to bring about lasting change. MI is explained to be a participatory process that is not coercive or forceful, but rather an approach that is client centered at its core. The process of MI is offered in the Latin prefix of *Inter*, suggesting that practitioner and client work together.

Building confidence and self-worth couldn't be a stronger tool in changing behavior. In a system where offenders may feel they are meeting expectations by failing, MI is non-judgmental, emphasizing strengths and values each offender already possesses. Discriminatory labels such as manipulative or antisocial

are deemed detrimental to MI progress. The goal is to build a desirable therapeutic alliance, representing a paradigm shift that comes as a welcomed surprise to offenders.

Like incarceration, parole and probation offer insufficient autonomy, limited voice, and minimal choice in one's own life. Offenders have lost their ability to say no. Under supervision, offenders have little control over their lives. Stinson and Clark stress the importance of creating an atmosphere where offenders are free to choose. MI, by recognizing that our clients are the experts on their lives, gives them value and purpose. The process of MI is guided by a trained practitioner, but the process belongs to the offender.

MI is empowering, a dismally foreign concept in corrections. Stinson and Clark outline how and when to offer advice to the client – as a guide – but maintain that ultimately the change is credited to the offender. We cannot force a person to change; however, criminal justice systems are often designed with very little power to choose. Offenders are given conditions to follow, programming to attend, and are often told where to live and what type of work to obtain. Stinson and Clark remind the reader that an offender “knows [their] own needs and capabilities better than anyone else.”

The language used to discuss the criminally involved population in this book is uniquely humanizing. MI not only acknowledges the experience of each individual, but places value and visions of potential that are often lacking in this field. It is refreshing to see a carceral process that avoids judgment, and provides strengths-based examination. The practitioner is instructed to use accurate empathy, compassion, respect, understanding, validation, with effective active listening as the foundation of MI in order to evoke behavior change.

While this book is outlined as a textbook, I felt inspired and energized to more actively implement MI strategies with my clients. The steps outlined in the book are clear and easy to follow, while at the same time demonstrate MI as a way of being. The book offers a breadth of information of the foundation of MI, how to navigate possible challenges, when to use MI, what to avoid, and at what stages to integrate different communication styles.

Chapter one offers an introduction to the evidence based practice of MI as a strategic way of communicating about change. It is acknowledged that no one is un-motivated, and it is our task to understand a person's motivation. Chapter two outlines the process; shifting the responsibility onto the offender to create change. Despite what has been engraved in offender's minds by our penal system and orchestrators of it, they have skills and strengths that are valuable, and what they say is worthwhile. Chapter three explores listening in an active and engaged manner, and chapter four addresses the process of interviewing, including examples and warnings.

In chapters five through eleven the authors elaborate in great detail on the four basic processes of MI: engaging, focusing, evoking, and planning. These stages are crucial in offering the reader insight into approaching behavior change by supporting and guiding, rather than inflicting further punishment. This is the process of eliciting and encouraging motivations that already exists. The authors anticipate the presence of resistance, and explore how to work with it to create discrepancy between their current lives and where they would like to be.

Chapter twelve assists with understanding resistance, and how practitioners may be contributing to that. Chapter thirteen

provides the roots of MI and its growing credibility after punishment techniques were exhausted. Chapter fourteen outlines how to implement and maintain continuous practice and growth using training and feedback. The concluding chapter offers considerations regarding perceived obstacles from the lens of the practitioners.

This book provides a guide through the change process from start to finish and is a must read for all working towards behavioral transformation. This book would be especially helpful for trainers, supervisors, and front line staff. If you have found confrontational approaches ineffective and are seeking an alternative, you may find this as revolutionary as I. While change does not come easily, with patience and the right tools, practitioners can contribute positively to offender success.

Jaime Tilston

PROBATION SCHOLARSHIP FROM THE SHORES OF IRELAND

Review of Irish Probation Journal–2017, edited by Gail McGreevy and Gerry McNally. Dublin: The Probation Service of Ireland and the Probation Board for Northern Ireland, Vol. 14, October 2017, 214 pages.

In the Fall 2017 issue of *Executive Exchange* we reviewed the 2016 issue of *Irish Probation Journal*, an annual peer reviewed publication produced by the Probation Service (PS) of Ireland and the Probation Board for Northern Ireland (PBNI) for the purpose of “providing a forum for sharing theory and practice, increasing co-operation and learning between the two jurisdictions and developing debate about work with offenders.” With its 2017 issue, this scholarly publication is now in its 14th year and continues to produce articles relevant to the community corrections profession.

As noted in last year’s review of the 2016 edition, this publication has an editorial committee comprised primarily of practitioners; in addition, it has an impressive advisory panel made up of scholars from Ireland, Northern Ireland, England, Scotland, Australia, and Canada.

The 2017 issue of this scholarly journal – Volume 14 – was received earlier this year. In introducing this latest issue, Editors Gerry McNally (PS) and Gail McGreevy (PBNI) write:

This edition of *Irish Probation Journal* features valuable and timely contributions from established academic authors and experts, new researchers introducing their work, probation practitioners telling us about their hands-on experience and leaders of the probation services, North and South, describing current challenges.

With articles on contemporary and emerging themes including the radicalization, the economics of interventions, desistance, ‘revenge porn’ and many other topics, we hope that *Irish Probation Journal* 2017 will help promote critical and constructive thinking, debate and discussion on the complex issues facing policy-makers, researchers, practitioners and the wider community in

criminal justice, and in relations to community sanctions, in particular.

In addition to the message from the editors, found in this latest issue are 13 articles – contributed by both practitioners and academicians – and three book reviews. Because of space limitations, only a few of the articles in this issue will be highlighted.

The lead article in this publication is contributed by Shadd Maruna, Professor of Criminology at the University of Manchester, and is entitled “Desistance as a Social Movement.” In this article, Professor Maruna defines desistance and describes the importance of research in this area, highlights some positive changes in the criminal justice system – both in terms of research and practice – and argues that to best understand desistance we must view it as a social movement rather than as an individual process, similar to “the Civil Rights movement or the recovery movements.” Further, he suggests that practitioners and academicians who do not grasp the importance of desistance research and its development will become less than relevant in the field of criminology. Professor Maruna concludes his article, which was adapted from his remarks at the 10th Martin Tansey Memorial Lecture delivered in Dublin in March 2017, with the following words of encouragement:

Far from undermining mainstream criminological teaching and research practices, such developments should breathe new life into the traditional classroom or research enterprise, making criminology more relevant, up to date and (indeed) defensible as an academic area of study. That is, inclusive social science is good social science. As such, I think the future is going to be a bright one for desistance research, and I look forward to working with the next generation of thinkers (and doers) in this area.

Cheryl Lamont, Chief Executive of the Probation Board for Northern Ireland, and Vivian Geiran, Director of the Probation Service of Ireland, contribute the next article – “Making the Difference That Makes a Difference: Leading Probation on the Island of Ireland.” In their article they discuss briefly the concept of leadership – distinguishing it from management and citing the work of several recognized management and leadership experts – and provide a description of their respective agencies; they also identify many of the challenges they and their predecessors have faced over the years and stress the importance of interagency cooperation in maximizing probation’s role in the criminal justice and social service systems.

“More than ‘Revenge Porn’: Image-Based Sexual Abuse and the Reform of Irish Law” is the title and the subject of an article contributed by Clare McGlynn, Professor of Law at Durham University, and Erika Rackley, Professor of Law at Birmingham University. In their informative article the authors define and provide a history of revenge porn, where “a vengeful ex-partner shares private sexual images without consent,” usually on social media. Examples of other forms of abuse, where women are far more likely than men to be victims, include but are not limited to hacked or stolen images, photographs of domestic abuse and violence, “upskirting,” sexualized photoshopping, sexual extortion, and recordings of sexual assault and rape. Drawing on the efforts of other countries to criminalize these harmful activities,

Executive Exchange

Professors McGlynn and Rackley offer a proposal to comprehensively address image-based sexual abuse that not only includes legislation and enforcement but education, public awareness, and victim support.

In “Pre-sentence Reports and Individualised Justice: Consistency, Temporality and Contingency,” Nicola Carr, Associate Professor of Criminology at the University of Nottingham, and Niamh Maguire, Lecturer in Criminal Law and Criminology at Waterford Institute of Technology, examine the history, importance, and the variation in use of the presentence report in Ireland. They conclude their paper by suggesting that legal reform is necessary “to ensure equity of approaches across the country.” This is a laudable goal, but one that may fall into the category of “wishful thinking.”

A particularly fascinating article is one contributed by Glenn Parker, an economist in Economic Advisory Unit of the Police Service of Northern Ireland (PSNI), and Gail McGreevy, Head of Communications in PBNI, entitled “An Economic Evaluation of Reducing Offending in Partnership.” They examine the Reducing Offending in Partnership (ROP), a partnership involving the PSNI, PBNI, Youth Justice Agency, Northern Ireland Prison Service, and the Department of Justice, along with several other organizations, designed to reduce the reoffending of the most prolific offenders in Northern Ireland and make communities safer. They evaluated the partnership program through two techniques commonly employed by economists: cost-effective-

ness analysis and cost-benefit analysis. The results of their research reflects that for every £1 spent on ROP returns a benefit of £2.20 in the form of reduced economic and social costs of crime.

Other interesting articles found in this issue include: “Understanding Radicalisation: Implications for Criminal Justice Practitioners” by Orla Lynch, a Lecturer in Criminology at University College Cork; “Women’s Transitions from Custody in Northern Ireland – Time After Time?” by Jean O’Neill, a PBNI Area Manager in Belfast; “Enhanced Combination Orders” by Paul Doran, PBNI Director of Rehabilitation; “Overview of a Group Work Programme: The Choices and Challenges” by Nicholas Clarke, a Probation Officer in Dublin; and “The Journey of Probation Domestic Abuse Interventions” by Nichola Crawford, a PBNI trainee forensic psychologist.

In addition to the print version, this latest issue of *Irish Probation Journal* may be accessed online by visiting <http://www.probation.ie/en/PB/Pages/WP17000058> or <https://www.pbni.org.uk/guide-information/services-offer/irish-probation-journal-2017/>.

The Probation Service of Ireland and the Probation Board of Northern Ireland are to be commended for making available the necessary resources – both human and financial – to produce this timely and informative professional journal.

Dan Richard Beto

As seen at the APPA Leadership Institute

Bring your people together.

Create a collaborative environment in which supervisors and officers can more effectively and efficiently communicate. That’s the power of Real Colors.



Real Colors®

800.622.1644 | www.NCTI.org | info@NCTI.org

319 East McDowell Road, Suite 200 • Phoenix, Arizona 85004-1539

Copyright © 2015, by NCTI®



NEWS FROM THE FIELD

NEW CHIEF IN HANDCOCK COUNTY, INDIANA

According to an article appearing in the *Greenville Daily Reporter*, in November 2017 **Josh Sipes**, a 17-year veteran of Hancock County Probation Department, was appointed Chief Probation Officer.

Sipes, who has served as probation officer in Hancock County since 2000, replaces his long-time mentor **Wayne Addison**, who was the county's Chief Probation Officer for 35 years.

For close to a decade, Sipes, a graduate of Ball State University with a degree in psychology, led Hancock County's juvenile probation program. Prior to being hired by the Hancock County, Sipes worked at a residential treatment facility for at-risk kids with emotional disorders and also for St. Vincent Health, mentoring children with autism and Asperger's syndrome.

According to the article by reporter **Caitlin VanOverbergh**, Addison retired from the job in September and said he spent his last few months on the job grooming Sipes to be his replacement. Calling Sipes "dedicated and hardworking," Addison said he's confident Sipes will do a great in his new position.

PROFESSORS AWARDED GRANT FOR NEXT-GEN ELECTRONIC MONITORING IN MASSACHUSETTS

An October 2017 media release from the University of Massachusetts – Lowell reports that Professor **April Pattavina** and **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.**, in criminology and justice studies won a grant with Associate Professor of Computer Science **Guanling Chen** to plan next-generation electronic monitoring. The media release by **Katharine Webster** follows.

Electronic monitoring can be a useful tool for supervising people on probation or parole. It tells case officers whether the offenders are going to work and school – or visiting trouble spots, like bars and drug markets.

What it doesn't do well is help offenders meet the conditions of their probation or parole so that they avoid violations and the resulting jail time, says Associate Prof. April Pattavina, who teaches in the School of Criminology and Justice Studies.

Now Pattavina has teamed up with two other faculty members – Ron Corbett in criminology and justice studies and Assoc. Prof. Guanling Chen in computer science – to develop the next generation of electronic monitoring, using smartphones and sensor technology along with GPS tracking to promote and reward constructive behaviors that can keep probationers on track and out of jail.

Pattavina, the principal investigator, and her team have just won a \$99,000 National Science Foundation planning grant for BEACON (Behavioral Economics Application with Correctional Opportunities Notification).

"For too long, we've focused on catching offenders when they screw up. It used to be "Tail, nail and jail," says Corbett, a part-time faculty member who previously served as acting commissioner of the Massachu-

setts Probation Service and executive director of the state Supreme Judicial Court. "We think we can cut down on probation violations this way."

The grant is part of a nationwide push for criminal justice reforms based on research evidence. Pattavina's team is building on studies that show rewarding positive actions can be more effective at changing behavior than simply punishing negative conduct.

"We're looking at different ways we could promote positive behavior, like reminding probationers about treatment appointments and job opportunities and then sending them positive reinforcement messages when they follow through," she says.

Corbett says police, prosecutors, judges and probation officers increasingly recognize that many people caught up in the criminal justice system are dealing with mental illness, addiction, poverty, homelessness, lack of education and other problems that make it hard for them to meet all the conditions of probation.

"One of the things we know about this population is they come in with significant deficits," Corbett says. "We underestimate how disorganized the average probationer is, and if you're not well-organized, you're in trouble."

Pattavina, Corbett and Ph.D. candidate Elias Nader will interview ex-offenders who have completed probation about what helped them succeed. They will also interview practitioners – police, probation officers and substance abuse treatment professionals – to figure out what strategies make the most sense to pursue.

Chen and his graduate students will figure out how to incorporate those strategies into a smartphone app or suite of apps, leveraging existing GPS functionality and emerging technologies.

"Think of it as a personal coach, like a weight-loss program, to keep probationers motivated and accountable," Chen says.

Monitoring capabilities that make use of sensing technology could also provide information about changes in behavior that indicate a probationer is at risk of violating probation conditions.

"With smartphones, we can know about the phone calls they're making, websites they're visiting and details of their behavior," Chen says. "But it's not just about surveillance. We may be able to incorporate prediction capabilities. For example, we can use algorithms to analyze movement and sleep patterns, along with cyber-activities, that could signal possible substance abuse or mental health problems. Case managers can then be alerted to provide an early intervention."

The team's primary goal is to divert those under community supervision before they get stuck in a cycle of crime, incarceration and recidivism. BEACON has the potential to make communities safer and decrease correctional costs while helping address the issues that got the probationers into trouble in the first place,

Pattavina says. Long-term, BEACON could provide a wealth of data, such as what services probationers use most frequently and which communities are in need of more resources.

“Research shows that just that message – that we want them to succeed and that we’re putting the pieces in place to help them succeed – can have a positive impact on behavior,” Corbett says.

Corbett, who serves on the Editorial Advisory Board of *Federal Probation*, is a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives.

CHIEF PROBATION OFFICER APPOINTED IN SANTA BARBARA COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

On December 1, 2017, Superior Court Presiding Judge **Patricia L. Kelly** administered the oath of office to **Tanja Heitman**, the new Chief Probation Officer for Santa Barbara County, California. Heitman replaces **Lupe Rabago**, who resigned.

Heitman had served as interim Chief Probation Officer since October 31, 2017. Prior to that she served as Deputy Chief Probation Officer of the Santa Barbara County Probation Department’s Adult Division, a position she held since May of 2013.

She earned her bachelor’s degree from Trinity University in San Antonio, Texas, in 1988, and began her career with Santa Barbara County in 1990 as a Juvenile Institutions Officer at the Santa Barbara Juvenile Hall.

During her 27-year tenure with the Department, Heitman has served within the Juvenile Institutions, Adult, and Administrative Divisions in a variety of capacities, enhancing her overall expertise in all areas of probation operations. She has served on numerous state committees related to funding and data within the probation field. She has been instrumental in the planning and implementation of Realignment in Santa Barbara County, working collaboratively with representatives from the Court, the Sheriff’s Department, the Offices of the District Attorney and Public Defender, and local community-based groups.

Heitman has been recognized on several occasions for her work in probation, including the Chief Probation Officer of California’s (CPOC) Staff of the Year Award, the Southern Region CPOC Employee of the Year Award, Santa Barbara County Probation Peace Officers Association President’s Award, and Santa Barbara County Chief’s Award.

MASSACHUSETTS PROBATION GENERAL COUNSEL RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF “2017 TOP WOMEN OF LAW”

Crispin Birnbaum, Massachusetts Probation Service (MPS) General Counsel, was honored in a November 2017 ceremony at Boston’s Marriott Copley Hotel as one of the state’s “2017 Top Women in Law” by *Massachusetts Lawyers Weekly*.

Birnbaum, who has had a long and impactful career in public service, was among 50 honorees from across the state who represented law firms; city, state, and local agencies; and private industry. She has 33 years of government and legal experience.

“I can think of no one more deserving of recognition as one of the 2017 “Top Women of the Law” than Crispin Birnbaum. This is a fitting acknowledgement of a 30 plus year career committed to the law and to public service in some of the most demanding and important positions in the Commonwealth.” said Probation Commissioner **Edward J. Dolan**.

As the MPS General Counsel, Birnbaum oversees the Legal Unit where she provides legal support to the Probation Commissioner, the agency, and its employees. She is a member of the probation executive and senior management teams and assists in the development of policy, legislative and litigation strategy, administrative goals, and initiatives. She also designs and conducts numerous training programs for employees. Before coming to probation in 2013, she served as the General Counsel for the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services (DYS).

Birnbaum began her legal career in state government in 1984 as a Middlesex County assistant district attorney. In the district attorney’s office, she prosecuted a variety of cases, including homicides, sexual assaults, and white collar crimes. In 1995, she was named chief prosecutor in the Public Protection Bureau of the Massachusetts Office of the Attorney General. As chief prosecutor, Birnbaum both prosecuted and supervised the prosecution of a variety of crimes involving the protection of consumer rights, civil rights, elderly and health care fraud, patient abuse, investment scams, and telemarketing fraud.

Following a two-year stint as chief prosecutor, Birnbaum became a member of the Trial Division in the Government Bureau of the Attorney General’s Office where her focus switched to civil litigation. It was in this position that she defended the Commonwealth, its agencies and employees in contract, tort, eminent domain, civil rights and employee matters both defensively and affirmatively. Birnbaum was given the Attorney General’s Award for Excellence in 2005. In 2006, she was named DYS General Counsel where she supervised a legal staff of 10, advised the agency on matters of policy, training, investigations, litigation, legislation, regulation, administration, and management.

Throughout her career, Birnbaum has served as a faculty member on both criminal and civil panels with Massachusetts Continuing Legal Education (MCLE), Massachusetts Bar Association (MBA), Boston Bar Association (BBA), and the Flaschner Institute. She has also served as an instructor at the Harvard Trial Advocacy Workshop and has spoken at conferences on juvenile justice issues in Washington, D. C.

NEW CHIEF IN RICHLAND COUNTY, OHIO

According to an article appearing in the *Mansfield News Journal*, in January 2018 **John Nicholson** began his new job as Chief Probation Officer of Richland County Adult Court Services in Mansfield, Ohio. Nicholson, who retired from the Richland County Sheriff’s Office in 2014 after 27 years, recently worked part-time in security at the Mansfield Municipal Courts.

In his new position he will oversee 20 employees, drug court, re-entry court, and building security. Nicholson replaces long-time Chief **Dave Leitenberger**, who will consult with the department on grant writing.

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 _____

- | | | | | |
|--------------|------------|---|----------------|--|
| CHECK | 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 | | |

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
