

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

SUMMER 1997

EXECUTIVE OF THE YEAR AWARD PRESENTED TO RONALD P. CORBETT, JR.

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Deputy Commissioner of Probation for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, was recognized as the Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year at the 1997 Annual Awards Breakfast of the National Association of Probation Executives. The award, presented on August 17, 1997, in Boston, Massachusetts, is given annually by the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University to a probation administrator for exemplary service to the community corrections profession.

In presenting the award, Dan Richard Beto, Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University and Secretary of the National Association of Probation Executives, cited Corbett for his service to the profession spanning a quarter of a century, his dedication to his agency, his scholarly contributions to criminal justice literature, and the visionary leadership he brought to the Association.

After graduating from Harvard, Corbett began his criminal justice career in 1972 as a Court Liaison Officer for the Massachusetts Department of Youth Services, where he remained for two years. From 1974 to 1982 he served as a Probation Officer and later as Assistant Chief Probation Officer for the

Brookline Division District Court. In 1982 Corbett joined the Office of the Commissioner of Probation in Boston as a Regional Administrator. During his tenure in the Commissioner's Office, he received several promotions and currently serves as Deputy Commissioner for Field Services.



During his career, Corbett sought and obtained related graduate education at Northeastern University, where he earned a master's degree in criminal justice in 1978; in 1995 he was awarded a doctorate in education from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst.

Corbett's scholarship is particularly noteworthy. He has published articles in *Federal Probation*, *Perspectives*, *Sociological Forum*, and *Justice Quarterly*. In addition, he is the Chairman of the Editorial

Committee of *Perspectives* and serves on the Editorial Advisory Committees of *Federal Probation* and *Corrections Management Quarterly*. His scholarly talents are not limited to writing, as he serves as an adjunct faculty member at the University of Massachusetts at Lowell and Harvard. Too, he is frequently called upon to provide technical assistance throughout the country.

cont'd

CONTENTS

Message from the President, <i>Dave Savage</i>	2
Guest Editor's Message, <i>Robert J. Bosco</i>	3
Adult Probation — 2005, <i>Connecticut Office of Adult Probation</i>	3
Risk Management as a Core Probation Policy, <i>James Sullivan</i>	5
The Continuing Quest for Effective Intensive Supervision Programs, <i>Betsy A. Fulton</i>	5
Intensive Supervision of Sex Offenders, <i>Connecticut Office of Adult Probation</i>	7
Violation of Probation Protocol, <i>Connecticut Office of Adult Probation</i>	7
News From the Field	9

Corbett is active in a number of professional organizations, most notable of which is the National Association of Probation Executives, where he has served as a board member, Vice President, and President. During his tenure as President the Association assumed a greater leadership role in community corrections nationally. He was instrumental in the creation of the National Coalition of Community Corrections Association, bringing together the Presidents of the major professional organizations to develop consensus on issues relevant to the profession. He expanded the Association's role in influencing the executive track at the annual institutes of the American Probation and Parole Association, and he was the driving force in creating a partnership between the Association, the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University, and the National Institute of Corrections to develop and deliver an Executive Development Program for newly appointed probation executives. Corbett was also responsible for negotiating a successful secretariat relationship between the Association and the Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University.

More recently Corbett has collaborated with John J. DiIulio, Jr., of Princeton University and the Brookings Institution to strategically rethink probation to meet the demands of the 21st Century.

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., is a great innovator, a leader, and a passionate spokesman for the probation profession. His selection as the 1997 Executive of the Year is a well deserved honor.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE



The NAPE Reception, Awards Breakfast, and Board of Directors Meeting held on August 16-17, 1997, in Boston in conjunction with the APPA Annual Institute were very successful. We had the largest turnout ever for both the reception and breakfast, and all officers and board members attended the Board of Directors Meeting. During the NAPE Breakfast Dr. Ron Corbett, past President, was very deservedly recognized as the 1997 Outstanding Probation Executive. Ron's leadership, authorship, and commitment to community corrections issues serve as a model of excellence for all of us to follow.

During the September meeting of the National Coalition of Community Corrections Associations in Alexandria, Virginia, at which it was my honor to represent NAPE, the coalition's 1998 agenda was set. One project that will have significant and exciting impact for a very broad set of interests is our hope to develop a set of value based guidelines to identify programs and practices as "best practices." What criteria ought to be considered in determining what really fits the label of "best practices"? In order to represent the ideas from the collective experience and expertise of NAPE members, I would like your thoughts. Please take the time to think about this and share a few of your ideas about what the guiding principles might look like in determining what meets the "best practices" label. Doing so will enhance the end result and make the product more meaningful and useful. I will need your comments by December 10, 1997. Please write me at the Washington State Department of Corrections, P.O. Box 41118, Olympia, Washington 98504, or e-mail me in care of the Secretariat at Sam Houston State University at <icc_drb@shsu.edu>.

During the upcoming year NAPE members will be working on several activities. Vice President Elyse Clawson did such a great job of developing sessions for the 1997 APPA Annual Institute's Leadership Track that we have asked her to take responsibility for this initiative for the 1998 Annual Institute in Norfolk, Virginia, and she has agreed. In the foreseeable future she will be soliciting your helpful ideas and participation. Ron Corbett and Dan Beto continue their work on the Probation Executive Development Program, with the first of these sessions occurring during the month of September in Huntsville. Robert Bingham will provide leadership among the Association's Board members to expand our membership over the next year. Bob and the regional representatives will appreciate your help in this effort. We will also be looking to NAPE members to assist in developing monographs on issues critical to our profession.

In closing, I would like to invite you to visit the Association's website at <<http://www.shsu.edu/cjcenter/association/nape.html>>.

Dave Savage
President

GUEST EDITOR'S MESSAGE



As guest editor of this edition of *Executive Exchange*, I am pleased to share with you Connecticut's approach to the supervision of adult offenders in the community. Under the Judicial Branch, the Office of Adult Probation is a statewide system providing supervision to over 56,000 offenders, conducting presentence investigations, and performing all other functions normally associated with probation services. It operates out of a central administrative office and 16 field offices. There are 240 (FTE) probation officers and current caseloads exceed 200. While the workload remains consistently high, (third highest average caseload per officer, according to the *Corrections Yearbook - 1995*) and resources dwindle, the agency remains focused on providing quality supervision and investigative services.

The articles presented here identify some of the more interesting and, hopefully, useful programs that have helped us clarify our role and restructure our resources in attempting to manage the overwhelming demand.

No agency, institution, or company can hope to achieve and sustain itself without defining its mission and measuring its outcomes. The article entitled "Adult Probation — 2005" will describe how this was achieved in Connecticut with the input of 400 staff members. "Risk Management as a Core Probation Policy" will describe several program components which provide direction and structure to the agency. While the concept of Intensive Supervision is not new, the application of a "balanced" approach to high risk offenders may hold some promise in changing behavior. This concept is being tested through a National Institute of Justice grant administered by the American Probation and Parole Association on the Hartford, Connecticut, Intensive Supervision Unit (one of two national sites). In addition, a collaborative approach in supervising high risk sex offenders in New London County appears to hold promise in involving the community in helping us do our work. Finally, Connecticut has developed and implemented a violation of probation protocol so that probation officers can hold offenders accountable for technical violations in a realistic fashion.

I hope you find these articles interesting and informative.

Robert J. Bosco, Director
Connecticut Office of Adult Probation

by the
Connecticut Office of Adult Probation

ADULT PROBATION — 2005

In the Fall of 1993, thanks to a technical assistance award from the National Institute of Corrections, Connecticut's Office of Adult Probation (OAP) launched its Vision Project in an attempt to assess its values, affirm its mission, and provide a clear direction through articulation of its goals and outcomes. The process took approximately two and a half years and involved the entire Division, some 400 people, including field staff, clerical workers, and administrators.

The project was driven by Fahy Mullaney of Pacesetter Consultants, who conducted a two day Vision Workshop for the administration. Following this, Mullaney trained four probation staff, who, in turn, held a series of workshops for the entire Division. The result was OAP's Vision, later to be mounted on wall plaques and distributed to all OAP offices.

Vision

The Connecticut Office of Adult Probation is an agency that:

is committed to the probationer's success;

provides every probationer with the knowledge and skills to promote positive change in their lives;

is committed to a safer world through partnership with the community;

has a diverse staff that works in an environment of mutual respect, open communication and trust;

encourages leadership to be exercised by all;

protects the community through the rehabilitation of the probationer; and

provides opportunities for personal and professional growth that is encouraged and recognized.

The entire Connecticut Office of Adult Probation staff participated in the forging of this vision and assume responsibility for attaining it!

Next, a cross section of staff formed a group of 24 who worked many hours redrafting the Division's mission and goals. Finally, smaller ad hoc work groups identified and defined the outcomes and data elements to be utilized to quantify our results.

As a result of this process, the following mission and goals were established for the Connecticut Office of Adult Probation.

Mission

The Connecticut Office of Adult Probation serves as an agent of the Judicial Branch, which uses suitable methods to control the behavior of probationers in the community and to positively impact the offender in order to reduce recidivism.

Goal I

To provide probationers with the knowledge and skills to promote positive change.

Outcomes

- Reduce recidivism
- Successful completion of probation
- Positive behavioral change

Goal II

Investigations and reports are of the highest quality and impact decisions.

Outcomes

- All investigations and reports meet or exceed standards
- Recommendations and court dispositions are consistent with case outcomes

Goal III

To provide staff with the resources and ability to perform their job function, experience professional growth, and work in a positive work environment.

Outcomes

- Staff will work in a positive and safe work environment
- Staff are afforded the opportunity for professional growth
- Resources are allocated equitably and efficiently

Goal IV

To provide advocacy, access, and support to make victims whole.

Outcomes

- Identifiable victims are not revictimized by the same offender
- Maximize restitution collection
- Ensure that all PSIs with victims contain victim statements
- Victims interest are accurately represented and they are informed of pertinent information
- Victims are satisfied with OAP services

Goal V

To provide the community with education, information, or interventions to promote reduction in probation recidivism.

Outcomes

- Maintain a positive presence in the community
- Violation of probation warrants served
- Increase our resources and in-kind services

This lengthy but necessary process will allow the Connecticut Office of Adult Probation to become a viable, results driven entity in the criminal justice system by 2005.

INFORMATION ABOUT EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

Executive Exchange, the quarterly journal of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE), publishes articles, reports, book reviews, commentaries, and news items of interest to community corrections administrators. In keeping with the ethical standards of NAPE, the contents of articles or other materials contained in *Executive Exchange* do not reflect the endorsements, official attitudes, or positions of the Association and the Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University unless so stated.

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

Submissions for publication consideration should be typed on 8½ by 11 inch paper, doublespaced, with at least one inch margins. Manuscripts should be submitted in duplicate. Persons submitting articles, commentaries, or book reviews should enclose a brief biographical sketch or resume and a black and white photograph for possible inclusion. Manuscripts exceeding one page in length should be submitted on a computer diskette, with the software used indicated.

Specific questions concerning *Executive Exchange* should be directed to Dan Richard Beto at (409) 294-1675. Facsimiles may be sent to (409) 294-1671. All correspondence regarding *Executive Exchange* should be sent to the following:

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

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

projects, targets sex offenders, family violence cases, and other extremely high risk probationers. These cases are serviced according to the agency's highest service standards and they are supervised in caseloads of 25-40. Other high risk cases are designated as Level I. These cases are supervised in caseloads of 60-90. Level I cases are subject to supervision standards which include objectives-based case planning and active community networking. Moderate risk cases (Level II) are supervised in large traditional caseloads. Casework standards for Level II cases focus on monitoring of compliance with conditions. The lowest risk population of probationers are designated as Level III cases. These cases are subject to minimal standards. Connecticut is currently exploring the feasibility of contracting with the private sector to monitor this low risk segment of its workload.

Program Measurement

Risk management programming requires ongoing evaluation. Connecticut's program goals, process standards, and outcome measures have been participatively defined and articulated. Risk assessment data, which includes a series of risk predictive items and a multiple item outcome scale, has been automated. Probation supervision process standards were developed and are being incorporated into a standardized supervisory evaluation process. It is expected that these two evaluative components will provide a data framework to evaluate and refine both the supervision process (intervention) and the results of supervision (outcome).

Organizational Planning

Implementation of risk management policy in Connecticut required significant organizational change, both in staff philosophy and in day-to-day operational methods. A comprehensive program of participative organizational planning, which was carried out over several years, focused on development and articulation of the agency's vision, mission, and core policies. Planning also resulted in the identification of key agency consumers and stakeholders and a series of related program goals and objectives. This ongoing planning process is used to integrate the tenets of risk management into operational policies and practices.

Summary

In summary, Connecticut has embraced and implemented risk management as a straightforward policy for managing probation resources. We are committed to the premise that these programs will promote and maximize probationer accountability, agency integrity, and public trust.

THE CONTINUING QUEST FOR EFFECTIVE INTENSIVE SUPERVISION PROGRAMS

by
Betsy A. Fulton
Consultant
University of Cincinnati

It was about six years ago that community corrections professionals sat at the opening session of the American Probation and

Parole Association’s Annual Institute and listened intently to Joan Petersilia’s report on the preliminary results of the now infamous nationwide experiment with intensive supervision programs. There was a curious mixture of excitement and disappointment among members of the audience: excitement about how this research might enhance our knowledge of offender supervision strategies; and disappointment as the results unfolded revealing that our newest innovation was not fulfilling its stated goals. Reports on the failures of Intensive Supervision Programs (ISP) to alleviate prison crowding or reduce recidivism were followed by debates about what we should be striving to accomplish with ISPs, which offenders should be targeted for participation, and how we should define success. These debates, while largely unresolved, have inspired continued progress and innovation in community corrections with efforts focused on developing knowledge-based programs that lead us to the ultimate goals of reduced recidivism and public safety. Once such effort resides within the Hartford Unit of the Connecticut Office of Adult Probation and the Second Judicial District of the Correctional Services of Iowa where a new model of intensive supervision has been implemented. This model is currently being evaluated by the APPA and the University of Cincinnati through a project funded by the National Institute of Justice.

The Prototypical Model of Intensive Supervision

In response to the research on ISP and the emerging research on principles of effective intervention (Gendreau and Andrews, 1990), and with the support of funding from the Bureau of Justice Assistance, the American Probation and Parole Association developed a prototypical model of intensive supervision. The conceptual framework for this model emphasizes the goal of offender change and includes a balanced approach to supervision. Traditional ISP practices such as those evaluated by RAND, centered around surveillance and enforcement activities and occasionally interjected treatment and services. The prototypical model focuses on the identification of, and intervention with, offender needs as a means of promoting behavioral change. Although surveillance activities continue to be an important element of the prototypical ISP, they are more purposeful — instead of merely “watching and catching” offenders, surveillance is designed to monitor offender’s social milieu and their progress in rehabilitative programming. Rather than conducting home visits and other field work to meet prescribed standards of supervision, officers engage in frequent “substantive” contact with offenders aimed at assistance and problem resolution. Furthermore, in contrast to the sole focus on negative consequences for noncompliant behavior, officers also use positive reinforcement to promote behavioral change.

In the prototypical model of intensive supervision, officers serve as advocates for offenders in the community by engaging in resource development and facilitating offender reintegration. They use their resources and skills to encourage prosocial behavior and reduce offender risk. As implied in the balanced approach to supervision, their arsenal of techniques includes a range of sanctions to control offenders in the community and to hold them accountable for their behaviors, and, if necessary, they remove offenders from the community in the interest of public protection. Critical elements of the prototypical model include a high risk/need target population identified through the use of a reliable risk/need instrument, small caseloads, an objectives-based case management system, and an available range of correctional interventions that meet certain principles of effectiveness.

The integrity of the prototypical model of intensive supervision depends on a complete ideological and behavioral shift from surveillance-oriented ISPs. To facilitate this shift, ISP officers within several jurisdictions across the nation participated in intensive training on the principles of effective intervention, objective-based case management, and risk/need assessment. ISP officers also participated in work groups responsible for developing program components, policies, and procedures that reflected the major tenets of the prototypical ISP. The Connecticut and Iowa agencies were selected to participate in the NIJ-sponsored study based on their successful implementation of the model.

The Research Design

The study involves an experimental design. As in the RAND research, the sites were responsible for identifying eligible cases for ISP and then for contacting researchers at the University of Cincinnati who randomly assigned the cases to ISP or traditional supervision. The random assignment of cases began in February of 1996 and continued through December 1996 at which time over 200 cases in each site had been assigned to one of the study groups. Comprehensive intake data were collected on each offender upon assignment and quarterly progress reports were completed on each offender throughout the study period. Data collection ended May 31, 1997, providing a variable follow-up period of five to fifteen months.

Two unique aspects of this research involve the use of the Correctional Program Assessment Inventory (CPAI) and officer attitude surveys to measure the extent to which the model has been implemented as designed. The CPAI, developed by Gendreau and Andrews (1993), was used to ascertain how closely the programs meet known principles of effective correctional treatment. The officer attitude surveys were used to measure the degree to which the ISP officers have adopted the attitudes and behaviors supportive of the prototypical ISP. The scores of both regular and ISP officers on these surveys will be linked with actual case outcomes to test whether or not these behaviors and strategies contribute to lower rates of recidivism than have been found in surveillance-oriented ISPs.

Key research questions to be addressed include: Are the ISP programs more restrictive and intensive than regular probation units? Does the prototypical ISP maintain public safety? Is the model effective in treating the needs of offenders? Is the prototypical ISP more successful with one type of offender or another? How effective are specific components of the ISP program? In addition to traditional recidivism measures, many intermediate outcomes will be examined to measure program effectiveness, including the length of participation in treatment and services, the number of program completions, the rate of drug/alcohol use, offender employment rates, the level of educational achievement, and changes in the level of offender risks and needs.

Conclusion

The results of this research will, no doubt, evoke similar feelings of excitement and disappointment. For no matter what the findings, they will be met with both support and opposition, and they will raise additional questions. It is this sort of intellectual debate and willingness to put our programs and practices to the test that contributes to the integrity of the community corrections professions and enhances our chances of achieving our stated goals.

representatives from the victim community. A community education curriculum is being developed to be implemented jointly by probation, treatment, and a victim representative. As part of the developmental process, informational meetings were jointly conducted with legislators, local political leaders, police personnel, and superintendents of schools in New London County prior to the ISOU becoming operational.

The ISOU began taking cases in January 1996. Thus far approximately 150 cases have been supervised by the unit with only one offender being arrested for a sex offense. While it is too early to evaluate the impact of the unit, a formal, independent evaluation is presently being conducted. The research design will compare outcomes of 75 offenders in the ISOU with 75 matched offenders supervised in two other offices within the state. The factors to be measured will include both outcome measures, such as recidivism, and process measures to determine length and success in treatment, substance abuse, and other factors. The early results of the evaluation will be available in the Fall of 1997.

VIOLATION OF PROBATION PROTOCOL

by the
Connecticut Office of Adult Probation

The Office of Adult Probation has devised a uniform protocol to assist the agency in utilizing its resources more effectively and to respond to clients more appropriately. The *Technical Violation of Probation Protocol* identifies specific guidelines for handling violations of probation by linking client risk, severity of client behavior, and available resources.

The goal of the violation process is to respond to the offender’s violation behavior in a way that is consistent, timely, and proportionate in order to safely maintain the probationer on supervision.

There are four objectives that this protocol expects to achieve:

- Increase the number of clients successfully completing the period of probation.
- Reduce the amount of court resources expended on violation of probation cases.
- Increase probation officer consistency.
- Decrease probation officer response time to violation cases.

The new protocol helps to identify with greater direction the probation response to high/medium/low risk cases. There are two types of violation of probation (V of P): (1) those convicted of a new offense; and (2) those violating the conditions of probation (Technical V of P). Generally, when an offender is convicted of a new offense, the court is notified by warrant, summons, or modification. If the offender has a technical V of P, the case is handled according to the risk that the client poses to the community, the severity of the client’s behavior or violation and the resources or responses available to the probation officer. In many low or medium risk cases where the violation is not severe, such as missing a reporting date, the probation officer is able to respond effectively without bureaucratic approval and, more importantly, without using valuable court time, both of which

INTENSIVE SUPERVISION OF SEX OFFENDERS: A COLLABORATIVE APPROACH

by the
Connecticut Office of Adult Probation

Recent legislation targeting certain sex offenders has had a dramatic impact on the criminal justice system in Connecticut. These laws call for longer and mandated periods of incarceration, extended periods of probation (up to 35 years), specialized sex offender treatment during incarceration, registration and notification of sex offenders, and the elimination of early probation termination of certain sex offenders. As a result, the Office of Adult Probation has taken the lead in coordinating the appropriate monitoring, supervision, and treatment of sexual offenders through a number of initiatives: a statewide contractual relationship was established with a certified treatment center in order to ensure uniform, consistent assessment(s) and treatment methodology; provided specialized training for a small group of probation officers to ensure that specialists are available in all field offices; restructured case assignments to ensure that sex offenders are supervised by these trained officers; and through a combination of state and federal funds, created a specialized intensive unit in New London County to supervise high risk sex offenders.

The Intensive Sex Offender Unit (ISOU) operates within the containment model of supervision. The unit is staffed by three specifically selected and trained probation officers who are on call 24 hours a day, seven days a week and with caseloads limited to 25 per officer. Community safety and risk reduction are the overriding philosophical approach for this unit. The articulated mission is to reduce recidivism of sex related behaviors during the period of probation through the monitoring, control, and habilitation of the offender. The goals are: to ensure that high risk sex offenders are adequately identified and assessed for both risk and need; to provide 24 hour monitoring of clients through a network of community supervision; to maximize the opportunity for every client to successfully complete or demonstrate sustained progress in treatment; and to ensure that those clients who continue to pose a significant risk to the community are held accountable for their behavior through swift intervention, including the speedy return of violators to court.

The uniqueness of this unit lies in the extent of collaboration with treatment, victims and the community. For example, treatment and probation administrators jointly interview probation officers to make sure that the appropriate officers are chosen to staff the ISOU. Monitoring, supervision, and treatment are seamlessly interwoven in that: intensive supervision is an element of the treatment plan; probation officers co-facilitate treatment groups; probation officers and treatment personnel make joint field visits and joint case decisions; all cases are jointly assessed and probation officer performance appraisals are conducted with input from treatment personnel; and contact with the offenders’ families, friends, employers, and school administrators are made, through the notification process, to enlist information and their cooperation in the supervision of the offender. In addition, technological communication has been established with state and local police to immediately notify probation of a “sighting” or “stop” of an offender; this notification policy was jointly developed by probation, treatment, and rep-

can delay efficient response. Time used for seeking approval and/or obtaining a warrant can be more effectively used, thus ensuring system resource availability for high risk cases.

In effect, the probation officer response to a technical violation is a function of the risk the offender poses to the community, the severity of the violation behavior, and the resources available (Table A). Once the offender risk and violation severity are determined (Tables B and C), the probation officer is allowed to chose a response within the appropriate range of responses (Table D). Guidelines (Table E) identify when the case must be staffed, that is, the case needs supervisory review and approval to exceed (or go below) the responses available.

Staffing, when required by the guidelines, should be conducted on a timely basis which is proportionate to violation severity and offender risk. Although a time frame of 30 days may be appropriate for less serious violation behavior, a more prompt response is appropriate for more serious violations.

A staffing/warrant request form will be submitted with all warrants whether or not staffing is required.

TABLE A

Probation Officer response is a function of	Client Risk
	Severity of Violation Behavior
	Range of Options

TABLE B

OFFENDER RISK		
High Risk	Medium Risk	Low Risk
Intensive Level I	Level II	Level III

TABLE C

VIOLATION SEVERITY		
High Severity Violations	Less Severe Violations	
Noncompliance with Residential Placement (Alternative Incarceration Center or Day Incarceration Center)	All other types of violations	
Failure to comply with evaluation or treatment for Mental Health/Sex Offender cases		
*Deliberate pattern of noncompliance		
Absconder after 60 days	Offender's behavior directly threatens an identifiable victim(s) (with special condition of no contact with victims)	
Multiple electronic monitoring curfew violations		
DWI Cases: Driving Under Suspension (with special condition not to operate a motor vehicle)		

* A "Deliberate Pattern" of non-compliance is, to some extent, discretionary. Some guidelines and factors to consider in making this determination would be the following: More than one missed appointment with three as a sensible benchmark; availability of client; credibility and history of client; reasons offered by client such as transportation, child care, employment and possible solutions. Non-compliance needs to be explored and solutions sought, when possible, prior to a determination of "Deliberate Pattern."

TABLE D

VOP RESPONSES

High Range	Medium Range	Low Range
Warrant Notice to Appear Extension of probation Modification Residential (AIC, Halfway House or treatment)	Residential Treatment (Outpatient to Inpatient)	Home/Field Visits Increase Contact Counseling Signed Contract Reprimand Interchange community service and monetary donation when feasible (\$5.00 = 1 hour) with court approval
Electronic Monitoring (House Arrest/Curfew)	Non Residential Treatment Charitable Contributions	
Intensive Supervision DIC Youth Confinement Center	Community Service Curfew Increased Urinalysis AIC	

TABLE E

VIOLATION RESPONSE GUIDELINES

Risk	Severity	Response	Guidelines
Level I	High	High	A high range response is generally appropriate. A medium or low range response on its own requires staffing.*
Level II	High	Medium	A medium range response is most appropriate. A high range response requires staffing.
Level III	High	Medium	
Level I	Low	Medium	A low or medium range response is generally appropriate. A high range response requires staffing.
Level II	Low	Low	A low range response is generally appropriate. High range and residential treatment responses require staffing.
Level III	Low	Low	

*Meeting with CPO/LPO

A consultation with the Supervisor will transpire when a response that deviates from the above chart is believed to be the most appropriate.

SECRETARIAT BEGINS THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN ARCHIVE FOR THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES

In an effort to develop and maintain an archive of the history of the National Association of Probation Executives, the Secretariat has started collecting significant documents of the organization and past issues of *Executive Exchange*.

To date, the following issues of *Executive Exchange* have been collected and are on file:

- Fall 1983
- Summer 1984
- Winter 1984
- Summer 1985
- Fall 1985
- Spring 1987
- Summer 1987
- Summer 1988
- Fall 1988
- Winter 1989
- Fall 1992
- Winter 1993
- Spring 1993
- Summer 1993
- Fall 1993
- Winter 1994
- Summer 1994
- Fall 1994
- All of 1995
- All of 1996
- All of 1997

If any member of the Association has issues of *Executive Exchange* not listed above, please consider sending them to the Secretariat offices.

Likewise, files of historical significance relating to the past activities of the Association, currently in the possession of past or present officers and directors, would be welcomed as well.

Please feel free to send material to the following:

Christie Haney
NAPE Secretariat
George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas 77341-2296

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

KIPP APPOINTED TO PENNSYLVANIA PAROLE BOARD

On July 1, 1997, Richard A. Kipp, Chief Adult Probation Officer for Lehigh County, Pennsylvania, became a member of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole. Kipp was appointed by Governor Tom Ridge and unanimously confirmed by the Pennsylvania Senate for a six year term on the nine member board.

Kipp, currently serving as Treasurer of the National Association of Probation Executives, has been involved in the criminal justice system for over two decades. After graduating from Iona College in New Rochelle, New York, he initially worked at the Children's Home in Easton, Pennsylvania. In 1976 he was hired as a Lehigh County juvenile probation officer in Allentown, Pennsylvania. A year later he was named a supervisor in the Lehigh County Adult Probation Department. In 1982 he was appointed Chief Adult Probation Officer for Lehigh County and earned a master's degree in social work from Marywood College in Scranton.

During Kipp's tenure in Lehigh County, he has seen a number of changes. When he became Chief Adult Probation Officer, the county had nine adult probation officers who supervised about 800 probationers; now there are 40 full-time officers who supervise about 7,200 offenders. To serve this growing population, Kipp and his officers adopted a number of innovative programs and strategies, including electronic monitoring, house arrest, job-readiness training, restorative justice program, drug monitoring, night supervision, and community service. In addition, interaction between officers and probationers has increased significantly, with most of the contacts being made in the field. Too, a number of his officers are now armed, which was not the case when he started.

While his new position on the Probation and Parole Board will afford him an opportunity to have a statewide impact on the criminal justice system, Kipp is leaving the Lehigh County department with mixed feelings, referring to his staff as his "family."

CALLANAN RETIRES IN CALIFORNIA

On June 27, 1997, Thomas J. Callanan, Chief Probation Officer for Riverside County, California, retired after 36 years of probation service. During his distinguished career, he served as director of probation for three of the nation's largest departments; in addition to the Riverside County Probation Department, Callanan was Director of the New York State Division of Probation and later was Chief Adult Probation Officer for Harris County, Texas.



Callanan, a 1958 graduate of Iona College and who earned a master's degree in criminal justice in 1971 from the John Jay College of Criminal Justice, has been a leader and innovator in probation. He introduced the concept of intensive supervision for high risk offenders in New York in the early 1970s and he fostered computerization of probation records and activities when computers were in their infancy. Callanan advocated mandatory training for all levels of probation staff and supported the arming of probation officers supervising high risk, dangerous drug offenders and gang members. He estab-

lished probation warrant units, home supervision programs, drug rehabilitation centers, restitution centers, and introduced the concept of boot camps for juvenile offenders in Riverside County. Riverside County's Twin Pines Ranch is considered one of the top ten programs for youth in the nation.

During his career, Callanan has been involved in a number of professional organizations. He served as the founding President of the New York State Probation Officers Association, President of the Middle Atlantic States Conference on Corrections, and President of the American Probation and Parole Association. He has served on the delegate Assembly and the Board of Governors of the American Correctional Association and on the Executive Committee of the Chief Probation Officers Association of California. In addition, he is a member of the California Probation, Parole, and Correctional Officers Association and the National Association of Probation Executives.

Callanan has been the recipient of a number of awards and recognitions. In 1971 he was presented the Claude E. Howley Medal for scholarship and public service and in 1977 he received the Brother Arthur A. Loftus Award for outstanding service in government and law. The American Probation and Parole Association presented Callanan with the Walter Dunbar Memorial Award in 1980 and in 1987 he received the Lester J. Hayes Award from *Correctional News* for his article "Punishment and Deterrence In — Compassion and Rehabilitation Out."

Callanan is particularly proud that two of his seven children, **John and Paul**, are following in his footsteps and are probation officers in San Bernardino, California. Callanan and his wife of 38 years, **Anne**, look forward to retirement and the future.

NAPE MEMBERS ASSUME LEADERSHIP POSITIONS IN APPA

During the American Probation and Parole Association's 1997 elections, several members of the National Association of Probation Executives were elected to leadership positions.

In addition to **Ray Wahl** of Salt Lake City, Utah, being elected President-Elect and **Dot Faust** of Phoenix, Arizona, winning the position of Secretary, five NAPE members were elected as Regional Representatives: **Vincent Iaria** of Yaphank, New York (Region 2); **James Wichtman** of Bowling Green, Ohio (Region 5); **Nancy Martin** of Chicago, Illinois (Region 9); **Rick Zinsmeyer** of Georgetown, Texas (Region 12); and **Sue Gionfriddo** of Santa Barbara, California (Region 16).

These elections not only speak well of the individual candidates, they also reflect favorably on the National Association of Probation Executives.

NAPE MEMBERS SERVE AS PRESENTERS AT THE 1997 APPA ANNUAL INSTITUTE IN BOSTON

The published program of the 22nd Annual Training Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association held in Boston, Massachusetts, on August 17-20, 1997, reflected a significant presence of NAPE members as presenters and moderators. Association members serving in this capacity included **Robert Bingham**, **Robert J. Bosco**, **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.**, **John F. Gorceyk**, **Tamara Holden**, **Vincent Iaria**, **Lawrence T. Jablecki**, **Sylvia Johnson**, **Nancy Lick**, **Nancy Martin**, **Arlene Parchman**, **Rocco Pozzi**, **Raul**

Russi, **Dave Savage**, **Donald Shaw**, **Don Stiles**, **Faye Taxman**, **Scott Taylor**, **Cherie Townsend**, and **Richard Wyett**.

NAPE's presence was also seen in the Institute's National Program Committee. **Dorothy Faust** served as the Program Chair and committee members included **Elyse Clawson**, **Tamara Holden**, and **Cherie Townsend**.

WALTER DUNBAR MEMORIAL AWARD PRESENTED TO SCHUMAN

Alan M. Schuman, a member of the National Association of Probation Executives, was the recipient of the Walter Dunbar Memorial Award at the 22nd Annual Training Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association. This award, the oldest APPA practitioner award, is given annually for significant contribution to the probation or parole profession.

Schuman, formerly with the Probation Department in Washington, D.C., is a corrections management consultant in McLean, Virginia. In addition to NAPE, Schuman is a member of the Middle Atlantic Correctional Association; he is also active in the American Probation and Parole Association, where he served as President. Since leaving public service, Schuman has served as a consultant in Arkansas, Illinois, North Carolina, Texas, and Wisconsin.

FAULKNER PRESENTED THE SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY AWARD AT APPA

J. Richard "Rick" Faulkner, Jr., a friend and strong supporter of the National Association of Probation Executives, was presented the Sam Houston State University Award at the APPA Annual Institute in Boston. This award, first given in 1986, is presented to a practitioner who has contributed to community corrections literature. Faulkner has devoted his entire professional career to the criminal justice system. Commencing three decades ago, Faulkner has worked with juvenile offenders, served as a United States Probation Officer, and worked for the Federal Bureau of Prisons; for the past ten years he has served as a Correctional Program Specialist with the Community Corrections Division of the National Institute of Corrections.

Faulkner has been instrumental in the development of a curriculum on officer safety and in the delivery of that material nationwide. In 1991 he produced *Chemical Agent: Instructor's Training Manual*, a publication of the National Institute of Corrections. In addition, he edited and contributed to *Topics in Community Corrections: Officer Safety*, published by the National Institute of Corrections in 1996. His scholarly efforts are practical in nature and may be applied to where the "rubber meets the road."

In addition to his focus on officer safety, Faulkner, representing the National Institute of Corrections, has worked closely with the National Association of Probation Executives and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University in the development of an Executive Development Program for newly appointed probation executives. Too, he has been instrumental in providing technical assistance to a host of community corrections agencies. In addition, he has managed the activities of three networks established by the National Institute of Corrections, including the Urban Chiefs Network, the Executives of State Probation and Parole Agencies Network, and the National Coalition of Community Corrections Associations.

NAPE ANNUAL AWARDS BREAKFAST HAS RECORD ATTENDANCE



Dan Beto presents award to Ron Corbett

cover of this issue of *Executive Exchange*, during this event **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.**, Deputy Commissioner of Probation for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Immediate Past President of NAPE, was presented with the Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year Award.

John Larivee of the Crime and Justice Foundation and **Michael Gritton** with MassINC delivered an exclusive presentation to NAPE members on the public's view of the criminal justicesystem. Also contributing to the presentation was **Rocco Pozzi**, Chief Probation Officer for Westchester County, New York, and President of the American Probation and Parole Association.



John Larivee

GUEST EDITORS NAMED FOR EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

The following persons have volunteered to serve as guest editors for the next four issues of *Executive Exchange*: **Dave Savage**, Fall 1997; **W. Conway Bushey** and **Richard A. Kipp**, Winter 1998; **Joann Fuller**, Spring 1998; and **Arlene Parchman** and **Ron Goethals**, Summer 1998.

Members desiring to contribute articles to these issues or who would like to volunteer to serve as a guest editor are encouraged to contact **Christie Haney** at the Secretariat.



COCHRAN LEAVES COMMISSIONER'S POST FOR TEACHING POSITION

Donald Cochran, former President of the National Association of Probation Executives, recently announced his decision to leave his position as Commissioner of Probation in Massachusetts, where he has

served as agency head for the last 13 years. Cochran has accepted an appointment as Visiting Professor and Fellow at the Center for Criminal Justice Policy Research at the College of Criminal Justice at Northeastern University in Boston.

Cochran has served a quarter of a century in the field of probation, beginning as a probation officer and holding a number of positions in the agency prior to his appointment as Commissioner in 1984. Among his many accomplishments as Commissioner, Cochran computerized the agency, including the establishment of a first-in-the-nation computerized registry for domestic violence restraining orders; in addition, he enhanced the professionalism of the agency's work through the development of performance standards and competency based hiring and promotion procedures.

Cochran holds a number of advanced degrees, including a doctorate in organizational development from the University of Massachusetts at Amherst. He has published, trained, and consulted widely. He was instrumental in the development of the first of NAPE's new probation executive orientation as well as a NAPE monograph, co-sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections, on *Managing Probation with Scarce Resources*.

In the organization's history, Cochran has been the only member ever to be elected President of NAPE twice. Other professional affiliations include serving on the Board of Directors of the American Probation and Parole Association and the Correctional Association of Massachusetts. In addition, he has served on a number of national and state commissions; he is a member of the Massachusetts Sentencing Commission, co-chair of the Technology Committee of the Massachusetts Supreme Court's Commission on the Future of the Courts, and the Community Corrections Chair of the National Institute of Justice Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Advisory Committee.

During his distinguished career, Cochran has received a number of awards and recognitions, including the Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year Award through the National Association of Probation Executives and the Howard Gill Award for lifetime professional achievement by the Correctional Association of Massachusetts.

Don Cochran has been a leader in community corrections, and his active participation in the probation profession will be missed.

NEW MEMBERS

Five new members have joined the Association since the last issue of *Executive Exchange* was published. They are as follows:

Vincent D. Basile, Regional Supervisor, Office of the Commissioner of Probation, One Ashburton Place, Room 405, Boston, Massachusetts 02108.

Neil T. Hannon, Chief Probation Officer, Porter County Adult Probation Department, 16 Lincolnway, Valparaiso, Indiana 46383.

Donald R. Smith, Director, Tarrant County Community Supervision and Corrections Department, 200 West Belknap, Fort Worth, Texas 76196.

Gerald R. Hinzman, District Director, Sixth Judicial District Department of Correctional Services, 951 29th Avenue S.W., Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52404.

Michael K. Brown, Director, Division of Field Services, New Hampshire Department of Corrections, P.O. Box 1806, Concord, New Hampshire 03302-1806.

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.

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.

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.

Membership Application (TAX # 58-1497263)

NAME _____ TITLE _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE # _____ FAX # _____ DATE OF APPLICATION _____

CHECK	Regular	☐ \$ 50 / 1 year	☐ \$ 95 / 2 years	☐ \$140 / 3 years
	Organizational	☐ \$250 / 1 year		
	Corporate	☐ \$500 / 1 year		

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

NAPE Secretariat
ATTN: Christie Haney
Correctional Management Institute of Texas
George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas 77341-2296
(409) 294-3757