

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

SUMMER 1998

EXECUTIVE OF THE YEAR AWARD PRESENTED TO RICHARD E. WYETT

Richard E. Wyett, who has devoted more than three decades of service to the criminal justice system, is the 1998 recipient of the Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year Award. This award, given annually for the past decade by the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University and the National Association of Probation Executives in recognition of exemplary and sustained service by a probation administrator, was presented to Wyett at the Association's annual awards breakfast on August 30, 1998, in Norfolk, Virginia, by Dan Richard Beto, Director of the University's Correctional Management Institute of Texas.

Wyett began his criminal justice career in 1967 as an auxiliary officer with the Reno Police Department. In 1972 he was hired as a Nevada Highway Patrol Officer, and two years later he was appointed a Nevada Adult Parole and Probation Officer. In 1978 he was promoted to Senior Adult Parole and Probation Officer; that promotion brought with it additional duties, and Wyett served as a District Rangemaster, Job Developer, and Director of the Volunteers in Probation Program. Five years later he was promoted to the position of Operations Supervisor, a position he held until 1989, when he was named Unit Manager with the adult parole and probation agency.

In 1991 Wyett was appointed by the Governor to the Nevada Board of Parole Commissioners, where he served until 1993 when the Governor named him Chief of the Nevada Division of Adult Parole and Probation. As head of this state agency, Wyett was responsible for over 400 employees, an annual budget approaching \$24 million, and the community supervision of 13,600 offenders. During his

tenure with the agency, Wyett forged coalitions with a number of agencies and organizations in an effort to promote public safety. In addition, he modernized a neglected agency and brought to it a number of innovative programs and strategies.



While Chief, Wyett's talents were recognized and called to use outside the agency on a number of occasions. He was appointed by the Nevada Legislature to serve on the Nevada Sentencing Commission and he was also appointed by the Governor to the Advisory Council for Community Notification of Sex Offenders. Too, the Nevada Supreme Court named him to a Task Force for the Study of Racial and Economic Bias in the Nevada Justice System.

Wyett's efforts have not been restricted to the state of Nevada. He has been active in the American Probation and Parole Association, the National Institute of Corrections' Executives of State Probation and Parole Network, National Order of Black Law Enforcement Executives, and the National Association of Probation Executives, where he currently serves on the Board of Directors as the Western Region representative. He has also been involved in the development and delivery of the highly successful Executive Development Program for newly appointed probation and parole executives, a joint initiative of the National Institute of Corrections, the National Association of Probation Executives, and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University.

In 1996 he was presented with the Just Works Program Award by the U.S. Department of Justice for developing FIST (Fugitive Interdiction Strike Team), a collaborative

CONTENTS

President's Message, <i>Robert L. Bingham</i>	2
Brain Development and Learning, <i>Judy Briscoe</i>	3
Turning Community Corrections Around, <i>David H. Bland, Ed.D.</i>	7
Putting the Community Back into Community Corrections, <i>Gary Hinzman</i>	9
News From the Field	11

effort between the Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Nevada Division of Parole and Probation to remove criminal aliens from Northern Nevada.

Since his retirement in 1998, Wyatt has continued to remain active, working on membership recruitment for the National Association of Probation Executives, serving as a criminal justice consultant in Nevada's gubernatorial election, being a mentor to newly appointed probation executives, and, more recently, becoming President of the Make a Wish Foundation for Northern Nevada.

The late George J. Beto, for whom the Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University is named, once made the following observation about "correctional leadership":

Organizations are largely the shadow of their executives It does not matter whether one is talking about Harvard University, the Chrysler Corporation, or the Texas Department of Corrections. The executive's skills and abilities, his sense of mission and dedication to duty, are decisive in determining how — and how well — an organization runs.

In selecting this year's recipient of the Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year Award, it is abundantly clear that the Awards Committee took into consideration Richard E. Wyatt's skills and abilities, his sense of mission, and his dedication to duty.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

1999 is a significant year for the criminal justice system in America as it marks the Centennial of the Juvenile Court of Cook County, Illinois, the first juvenile court established in the United States and the world. In 1899, remarkable women led by the Hull House's Jane Addams and the men of the Chicago Bar Association made history through the development and passage of specific Illinois legislation which created a separate and distinct court for children to ensure their removal from adult jails and poor houses.

In honor of this significant birthday, the Juvenile Court of Cook County is busily planning a series of commemorative events and activities through the development of a Children's Court Centennial Committee. A diversified array of viable and pertinent public events, recognitions, publications, and related activities are being planned to honor the history, culture, and contributions of the Juvenile Court of Cook County, raise public awareness and additional involvement with children at risk, better mobilize and increase community support, and generate best professional practices within the juvenile justice industry.

In my capacity as President of the National Association of Probation Executives, I have conferred with Kitty Juda, Centennial Coordinator, in Chicago, and I have pledged my personal and professional support for this meaningful initiative. Ms. Juda indicated during our conversation that interest and support for the Centennial extends far beyond Chicago and Illinois. Whether your responsibility pertains to juvenile, adult, or both correctional populations, I en-

courage you to contact Ms. Juda in Chicago in order to be placed on the Centennial mailing list and receive additional information as it develops; she may be reached at the following address:



Ms. Kitty Juda, Centennial Coordinator
Juvenile Court of Cook County
2245 Ogden Avenue, 8th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60612

Ms. Juda's telephone number is (312) 433-4939 and her facsimile number is (312) 433-5267.

On a related matter, during the NAPE Board of Directors meeting in Norfolk, Virginia, on August 30, 1998, members of the Board indicated their support of the Association's involvement in the Centennial activities.

In closing, let me express my appreciation to those of you who journeyed to Virginia in August to attend the 23rd Annual Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association in Norfolk and, in doing so, shared your time and talents with other NAPE members during our Association-related events. Too, I extend to Richard E. Wyatt of Nevada congratulations for being selected the 1998 Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year.

Robert L. Bingham
President

BRAIN DEVELOPMENT AND LEARNING

by
Judy Briscoe
Chief of Staff and Director of Delinquency Prevention
Texas Youth Commission
Austin, Texas

Having spent a quarter of a century in the juvenile justice field, the last five of which have been focused on delinquency prevention, I am more convinced than ever that we cannot begin too early if we want a society of healthy, productive, pro-social children and youth. Researchers and practitioners used to advocate for pre-school programs as the best point at which to begin working with children. With the advances in molecular biology, genetics, and imaging techniques, we know more in the last ten years about brain development than in all of previous history. With this incredible technology, scientists have discovered that pre-school programs can be too late. The first three years of a child's life are the most important in terms of brain development.

Much of the information provided by the Texas Youth Commission's Prevention Yellow Pages, www.tyc.state.tx.us/prevention, relates to research studies and programs that promote the healthy development of children and youth. One of the most interesting books that the prevention staff have discovered is entitled *Inside the Brain* by Ronald Kotulak.¹ This book is based on a series of articles on the brain, published by the *Chicago Tribune*, for which Kotulak won the Pulitzer Prize. The following article is based primarily on Kotulak's book, with other information from TYC's Prevention Yellow Pages.

The most important thing to understand is that the first three years of a child's life are critically important to brain development.

- Brain development that takes place before age one is more rapid and extensive than previously realized;
- Brain development is much more vulnerable than ever suspected;
- The influence of early environment on brain development is long lasting;
- The environment affects not only the number of brain cells and the number of connections among them, but also the way these connections are "wired";
- There is scientific evidence for the negative impact of early stress on brain function.²

Unfortunately, for a growing number of children, the period from birth to age three has become a time of abuse, neglect, stress, violence, and little or no stimulation.

To put things in perspective, at eight months, a baby's brain has about 1,000 trillion connections, which gradually begin to decline. Half of the connections die off by age ten. Twice as many connections are made as needed, to guarantee that a newborn will have sufficient extra wiring to be able to receive input from *any* environment and adapt accordingly. Scientists have shown that synapses come and go with mental stimulation and *synapses are the key to brain power*.

The brain gets built by using the outside world to shape and reshape itself, by undergoing crucial phases of development

during which the presence or absence of appropriate stimulation can have lifelong effects — both good and bad.

This tremendous flexibility is called "plasticity" and it is a startling departure from the old concept of the brain as a self-contained, hard-wired unit that learns from a preset, unchangeable set of rules. This new knowledge makes clear how nature and nurture interact to determine the kind of people that children become.

How the Brain Gets Built

Medical researchers and human services and juvenile justice practitioners could see that a child who is loved and given stimulating experiences usually turns out to be a bright, affable person, while an abused child often becomes an abuser. But no one knew what actually happened inside the brain.

The data clearly shows the correlation between abuse and neglect and delinquency. In fact, Cathy Spatz Widom's "The Cycle of Violence" indicated that those children who were abused or neglected were

- 53% more likely to be arrested as juveniles;
- 38% more likely to be arrested as adults;
- 38% more likely to be arrested for a violent crime; and
- 77% more likely to be arrested if females.

A more troubling conclusion was that a child who is neglected is just as likely as a child who is abused to be arrested for a violent crime. *And unless there is neurological damage from the abuse, neglect has a longer term, more damaging impact to the development of a child.*³

The brain goes through crucial periods in which brain cells must have certain kinds of stimulation to develop such powers as vision, language, smell, muscle control and reasoning. Genes, the chemical blueprints of life, establish the framework of the brain — and then the environment takes over and provides the finishing touches.

Just as the digestive systems of all infants require milk before they can eat solids, the brain requires stimulation: touch, holding, sound and vision.

Let's consider some of these studies:

Language: Children whose mothers talk to them frequently have better language skills than do children of mothers who seldom talk to them. After about age 12 the ability to learn new languages declines rapidly.

Vision: Lack of visual stimulation at birth will cause those brain cells designed to interpret vision to dry up or be diverted to other tasks, making perfectly healthy eyes permanently unable to see. This has saved the sight of thousands of infants born with cataracts, which are now removed as quickly as possible. **Brain Power:** Pioneering studies also show that the IQs of children born into poverty, or of those who were premature at birth, can be significantly raised by exposure to toys, words, proper parenting, and other stimuli.

Aggression: Early exposure to violence, stress, and other environmental pressures can cause the brain to run on a fast track, increasing the risk of impulsive actions and high blood pressure.

Emotions: Animals exposed to unpredictable stresses while still in the womb develop anxious personalities. After birth, a little extra mothering has the opposite effect, instilling them with confidence and the urge to explore.

Touch: Premature infants whose sensory systems are activated by being held and cuddled are more mentally alert and physically stronger than those who are routinely isolated in incubators. *Education:* The best time to learn foreign languages, math, music and other subjects is between one and about 12 years of age, yet education is not structured to take advantage of this time.

Mental Workouts and Brain Power

Scientists discovered that the power of a brain grows in direct relationship with the number of cells it has. The secret is the total number of brain cells and the number of connections between them.

About halfway through fetal life, when some brain cells start to die and a unique brain takes shape, sex differences and temperament begin to emerge. After birth, another wild spurt of growth occurs as the brain races to make connections. Then another massive die off occurs as half of the connections disappear by puberty.

The number of connections could easily go up or down by 25% or more, depending upon whether a child grows up in an enriched environment on in an impoverished one. The trillions of connections that survive the great die-off owe their survival primarily to what a child learns in his or her first decade.

Learning foreign languages is a clear example. Before puberty most children can easily learn a language without an accent. The excess connections enable a youngster to learn the slightest nuances of sounds as they are spoken.

Language development helps to illustrate how the brain is genetically programmed to respond to stimuli at certain critical periods. Without exposure to spoken words, cells that allow the brain to construct meaningful sentences do not develop properly. They die or more aggressive cells in other parts of the brain usurp their function.

The fetal brain and the developing brain are very different structures from the adult brain, and the developing brain of a baby is really not a small version of an adult brain.

Scientists in the 1960s and 1970s showed that sensory experience is essential for teaching brain cells their jobs, and after a certain critical period, brain cells lose the opportunity to learn those jobs.

Even if a person’s brain is perfect, if it does not process visual experiences by the age of two, the person will not be able to see, and if it does not hear words by age ten, the person will never learn a language.

How many connections are kept depends on the learning experiences to which the brain is exposed. The evidence indicates that the more connections you have, the smarter you are.

Another important discovery is that words can be just as powerful as drugs in correcting errant brain pathways that are causing some mental diseases. Using high-tech imaging devices that can “see” the brain processing thoughts, scientists showed that behavior therapy produced the same kinds of physical changes in the brain as psychoactive drugs. Behavior therapy and drugs appear to rearrange brain circuitry in the same way.

How the Brain Learns to Talk

Children who were born deaf and had never learned to speak were hearing and using spoken language for the first time with the aid of surgically implanted devices that sent sounds into

their brains. They heard them as words, not noises, and as words they came out.

If science can develop a better understanding of language development problems, experts believe that strides can be made in dealing with a host of other emotional, social, and behavioral problems.

The critical period for learning a spoken language is totally lost by about age ten. By using an artificial ear called a cochlear implant, scientists were able to activate some of the disconnected nerve pathways, enabling rough sounds of the human voice to reach the brain.

Scientists now know that language appears to have been acquired late in genetic evolution and so it doesn’t have a permanent position in the brain as do vision, smell or hearing. While 90% of right-handers process speech and language in the left side of the brain, 30% of left-handers process language in the right side of their brains.

A child can learn language merely by hearing it, sharing the most complex ideas and emotions of a culture without ever having to read or write. Language is so important to humans that the brain will not let it go. Unlike vision or touch, language can shift to different cells at opposite sides of the brain when need be. For instance, children who suffer major damage to the left side of the brain can acquire language using the right side of the brain, up until about age seven.

When the brain can’t process sounds quickly, its ability to learn language is impaired. An estimated 10% of children have developmental language disability. They hear and see perfectly well, but their brains process sensory information slowly.

These kids are in big trouble in the early stages of learning to talk. If children are having trouble distinguishing speech sounds, like “ba” and “da,” that’s going to impact how they learn grammar, how they eventually learn to read, on all sorts of things.

When these children listened to language that was slowed down to stretch the intervals between the sounds of vowels and consonants, they had no trouble understanding speech that they couldn’t comprehend at normal speeds.

Correcting language disorders is vitally important. Children who don’t develop normal language at the expected age are at high risk for all kinds of problems — academic, social, behavioral — that had not been previously linked to language impairment.

Beyond the age of about 12, learning a language becomes much more difficult, as it involves the building of new connections and tearing apart of old ones.

Who decided that foreign languages should be taught in high school? Society is not paying attention to the biological principles of education. The time to learn languages is when the brain is receptive to these kinds of things, and that’s much earlier, in preschool or elementary school.

The Effect of Violence and Stress on Kids’ Brains

A new kind of epidemic is ravaging children: brain damage caused by bad experiences. Such damage, the evidence indicates, can increase the risk of developing a wide range of ills from aggression, language failure, depression and other mental disorders to asthma, epilepsy, high blood pressure, immune-system dysfunction and diabetes.

These problems are increasing as the forces that generate stress — poverty, violence, sexual abuse, family breakup, ne-

glect, drugs, lack of good stimulation, too much of the wrong kind of stimulation — continue to escalate. These bad experiences, pouring into the brain through the senses, can organize the trillions of constantly active connections between brain cells into diseased networks.

Bad experiences affect the brain primarily through the stress hormones such as cortisol and adrenaline. Designed to respond to psychological or physical danger, these hormones prepare the body for “fight or flight.” But when these hormones are overactive due to persistent stresses during fetal development or early childhood, they can take over genetic regulation.

The brain is very resilient and maintains an even course in the face of the most outrageous experiences. That’s why most children born into conditions of poverty and violence come out okay. Scientists suspect that the reason some children, regardless of social or economic status, come out with damaged brains may be that they are genetically more vulnerable to stress. Furthermore, their bad experiences are not neutralized by a caring parent or involved adult.

The things that are associated with resilience have to do with protective factors like the quality of home life, the parent-child relationship, or another relationship that provides some security for the child.

Violence has become an overwhelming and pervasive way of life for many youngsters. The brain responds to experience. Children who are raised in impoverished conditions are at high risk of having impoverished brains.

A recent nationwide study showed that one child in five under age 18 has a learning, emotional, behavioral, or developmental problem that researchers say can be traced to the continuing dissolution of the two parent family.

Forty-two percent of families in the United States with children start out with one, two, three strikes against them. The first strike is lack of education: the mother has not finished high school. The second is lack of commitment: the mother and father are not married. The third is lack of maturity: the mother is under 20 years of age. One new family in nine has all three strikes against it.

New research demonstrates that nature and nurture are both constantly in play. Finding these children and altering the detrimental experiences as early as possible can change the course of their lives.

An epidemic of mental problems has caught researchers off guard. In the last 25 years, there has been a doubling of the rates of depression, suicide, crimes of violence, drug and alcohol abuse. The main culprit is stress.

Dr. Bruce Perry, Vice Chairman for Research, Department of Psychiatry, Baylor College of Medicine, who has done extensive research on Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) in children, states that many children are raised in violent, abusive surroundings over which they have no control. The antidote is giving children a sense of self-worth and teaching them that they are not helpless. “If there’s somebody out there who makes you feel like you’re special and important, then you can internalize that when you’re developing your view of the world. When you look at children who come out of terrible environments and do well, you find that someone in their lives somehow instilled in them the attitude that they aren’t helpless, that they aren’t powerless, that they can do something.”

Perry further states that many children don’t get that antidote in time. They often are verbally impoverished on the one

hand, but extremely rich in stressful experiences on the other. They are above average in reading nonverbal cues that tell them when others may be threatening or vulnerable. But they get into trouble by misinterpreting some of these visual cues. This makes them at risk for developing a variety of problems. Further, stress hormones ratchet up all of their reactions so that their hearts beat faster, their blood pressure is higher, and they are more impulsive.⁴

Averting Retardation through IQ Boosts

Pushing the right biological buttons in the brain, scientists are finding they can make the future brighter for many children whose development otherwise would have been stunted. Based on preliminary results, they can boost IQ levels by 20 to 25 points, reduce mental retardation by 50%, and cut school failure rates by much more.

Studies with impoverished children as young as six weeks, who were provided with enriched environments and then tested at 12 years, showed that the benefits of early intervention endured. The enriched youngsters had significantly higher IQs than the control group.

The first clear evidence of the enriched intervention came when the children were three years. Children in the intervention group had IQ scores in the normal range, whereas the average IQ in the control group was 20 points lower. All of the children in the intervention group whose mothers had IQs below 70 climbed the intellectual ladder as a result of the stimulating experiences and had normal IQs. The children of low-IQ mothers in the control group likewise became borderline mentally retarded.

The benefits of intervention rolled into the school years. While 50% of the control group failed one or more grades by age 12, only 13% of the intervention children had similar failures.

Scientific brain research reinforces what some of the longitudinal studies indicate. For example, we must begin supporting home visiting programs for mothers who are at risk of abusing or neglecting their children. An evaluation of the Hawaii Healthy Start program, one of the first home visiting programs, demonstrated that for mothers who agreed to participate, child abuse and neglect was averted in 99.7% of the cases.⁵

Pre-school programs should be in every community. The High/Scope Perry Preschool Project assessed whether high-quality preschool programs could provide both short and long term benefits to children living in poverty and at high risk of failing in school. The study followed into adulthood the lives of 123 such children from African-American families in Ypsilanti, Michigan, in the 1960s.

Findings at age 27 indicated that in comparison with the no-program group, the program group had:

- Significantly higher monthly earnings;
- Significantly higher home ownership;
- Significantly higher level of schooling;
- Significantly fewer received social services in the last ten years;
- Significantly fewer arrests by age 27.⁶

Tracking Down the Monster Within Us

A profound discovery is that genetic defects produce abnormal levels of serotonin and noradrenaline, two potent brain

chemicals that researchers have successfully manipulated to make animals more or less violent. Several studies also suggest that threatening environments can trigger serotonin and noradrenaline imbalances in genetically susceptible people, laying the biochemical foundation for a lifetime of violent behavior.

Serotonin, the brain’s master impulse modulator for all emotions and drives, especially keeps aggression in line. Noradrenaline, the brain’s alarm hormone, recognizes danger and organizes the brain to respond to it by producing adrenaline and other chemicals.

Normal aggression has a set point, which is regulated by brain chemicals. Most people are born with a balance. Changing the set point can either increase or lower aggression.

At normal levels, serotonin keeps in check primitive drives and emotions. Such control is exerted through the neocortex, the part of the brain that oversees socialization, memory, and judgment and controls the deeper parts of the brain that harbor primitive instincts and emotions.

Anything that happens to the thinking, outer surfaces of the brain, can interfere with serotonin’s ability to keep the basic instincts in line.

Many people inherit a gene that makes them more susceptible to low serotonin. But early life experiences — living in a violent household or a normal one — appear to determine how that gene will be expressed.

Why Some Kids Turn Violent

For millions of American children, the world they encounter is relentlessly menacing and hostile. So, with astounding speed and efficiency, their brains adapt and prepare for battle. Cells form trillions of new connections that create the chemical pathways of aggression; some chemicals are produced in overabundance, some are repressed.

In studies with children and adolescents with disruptive behavior disorders, low serotonin levels was the single most accurate predictor of which youngsters would go on to commit more violent crimes or suicide. Conversely, high levels of noradrenaline were the chemical signature of Post Traumatic Stress Disorders.

The rising tide of abuse and neglect of children occurs during the critical period when children are developing what is called “moral emotions.” These are emotions that are rooted in brain chemistry and are established in the first three years of life. The development of impulse control occurs at a time when sensitivity toward others is also being rooted in a child’s personality. The brain’s alarm network, called the locus coeruleus, sits at the base of the brain and sends out noradrenaline pathways to other brain centers that control heart rate, breathing, blood pressure, emotions, and motivation.

When the locus coeruleus finds itself in an uncontrollable, threatening environment, it sets its noradrenaline gauge on high. Over the pathways come surges of the stress hormone that keep the body in a constant state of readiness — heart racing, blood pressure high, easy to startle, quick to blow up. These are the PTSD children.

Perry says that these children are in double trouble. They’re at risk because they don’t have the opportunities to learn the traditional ways that enable people to get along in society, and they are at risk because the brain systems involved in impulsivity are poorly regulated. The increased tendency to act before

thinking, combined with language handicaps and poor problem solving skills, predisposes these children to use aggressive and violent strategies to deal with life’s daily challenges.

While high noradrenaline and low serotonin appear to be behind the huge rise of impulsive, hot-blooded crime in the United States, scientists are also starting to study the effects of low noradrenaline which is linked to cold-blooded, premeditated crime. Researchers are finding that the differences between high and low noradrenaline may be two sides of the same coin — impulsive, hot blooded killers vs. remorseless serial killers who coolly look for vulnerable victims they can stalk to rape, rob or kill.

Baylor’s Perry is studying children who start off in the alarm state with high noradrenaline and impulsive behavior, and then around puberty convert to low noradrenaline, low arousal, and predatory behavior.

One explanation for the change may be that brain cells exposed to constant stress burn out, dropping to a lower level of activity to save themselves. Perry said it’s really scary to watch the transition from high arousal to low arousal. “They change from being victims to victimizers and they develop this incredible icy quality of being emotionless.”

Like the generational increase in depression after World War II, every generation since the 1950s has seen an increase in young female aggression. The pattern that is emerging is of girls who are increasingly victims of child abuse, who grow up angry and have children with men who are likely to also be aggressive. As a result, succeeding generations of children are being born to aggressive parents and into aggression-inducing environments.

We’ve considered the interplay between biological influences — nature — and environmental influences — nurture — and it’s a daunting concept for the future of this society unless we as prosocial, responsible adults get involved. Dr. John J. DiIulio, Jr., Professor of Politics and Public Affairs at Princeton University, coined the perfect phrase for the environment in which many children find themselves: “Moral Poverty.”

Moral poverty is the poverty of being without loving, capable, responsible adults who teach you right from wrong. It is the poverty of being without parents, guardians, relatives, friends, teachers, coaches, clergy, and others who habituate you to feel joy at other’s joy, pain at other’s pain, happiness when you do right, remorse when you do wrong. It is the poverty of growing up in the virtual absence of people who teach these lessons by their own everyday example, and who insist that you follow suit and behave accordingly. In the extreme, it is the poverty of growing up surrounded by deviant, delinquent, and criminal adults in chaotic, dysfunctional, fatherless, Godless, and jobless settings where drug abuse and child abuse are twins, and self-respecting young men literally aspire to get away with murder.⁷

So what can be done to counteract this? Adults and communities need to embrace children and assume responsibility for their positive outcome. Children and youth need the nurturance and guidance of a positive adult role model. Research shows that mentors can make a significant difference in a child’s life.

- A caring adult parenting figure is often associated with a good outcome for the child.
- A caring adult is the most significant and consistent prevention influence during a major disaster, trauma, deprivation or abuse.
- A caring adult causes the child to see himself or herself as likable or important.
- Abused children who have a good association with an adult are less likely to abuse as parents.⁸

Conclusion

As was stated earlier, children need to be born healthy and deserve capable, nurturing parents. Society can’t wait until a child gets referred to the juvenile justice system to intervene. By that time, there have been too many victims and the behavior is so inculcated to make a significant, lasting change, if not impossible. If it were a perfect world, all children would have a healthy, nurturing and enriched environment with two loving, caring adults, but that is simply not the case. If society is ever going to be able to manage its criminal justice system, then it must focus on the front end where the return on the dollar is the greatest. And, if we as citizens don’t want to live in a police state and yet want a safe and secure environment, then we must assume responsibility for the outcome of some of these less fortunate children. Government neither can nor should be solely responsible for the future of children.

References

¹ Ron Kotulak, *Inside The Brain. Revolutionary Discoveries of How the Mind Works.* Andrews and McMeel, A Universal Press Syndicate Company, Kansas City. 1996.

² “Starting Points. Meeting the Needs of Our Youngest Children,” The Report of the Carnegie Task Force on Meeting the Needs of Young Children. Carnegie Corporation of New York. April 1994.

³ Cathy Spatz Widom. “The Cycle of Violence,” National Institute of Justice *Research in Brief*, October 1992.

⁴ Bruce D. Perry, M.D., Ph.D. Vice Chairman for Research, Department of Psychiatry, Baylor College of Medicine. Chief of Psychiatry, Texas Children’s Hospital.

⁵ Ralph B. Earle, Ph.D., “Helping to Prevent Child Abuse — and Future Criminal Consequences: Hawaii Healthy Start,” National Institute of Justice *Program Focus*. October 1995.

⁶ *The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 27*, edited by L. J. Schweinhart and D. P. Weikart (Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press, 1993).

⁷ John J. DiIulio, Jr., Ph.D., “Fill Churches, Not Jails: Youth Crime and ‘Superpredators,’” Statement before the United States Senate Subcommittee on Youth Violence, February 28, 1996. [Online] Available: John DiIulio Testimony <http://www.brook.edu/pa/hot/diulio.htm>

⁸ Michelle Lea Cherne Anderson, “The High Juvenile Crime Rate: A Look at Mentoring as a Preventive Strategy.” *Criminal Law Bulletin*, Vol. 30, No. 1 (1994), pp. 54-75.

An earlier version of this article appeared in the July 1998 issue of *Texas Probation*, the journal of the Texas Probation Association. It is reprinted with permission.

TURNING COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS AROUND

by
David H. Bland, Ed. D.
Vice President
Norment VoiceTrack
Montgomery, Alabama

We have all grown up with the notion that nothing is more certain than death and taxes. But those of us involved in community corrections have learned two other truisms: One, case-loads and their attendant demands will keep increasing. Two, the public has an insatiable appetite for the sensational “I told you so” indictment. The tragedy is that these truisms have such stultifying effects that we often find ourselves immobilized. There are three areas which have been most visibly affected by the impact of these truisms.

The Use and Coordination of Offender Supervision Technology

Of all of the areas in community corrections, the unabated growth of caseloads and the always at the ready threat of public criticism have almost stifled the most creative use of technology. The local community corrections’ staff, has to a large measure, become fixated on just getting through the day. They can ill afford having what time they have, used up by a salesperson presenting something that they have neither the time to think about nor the inclination to consider. In the early 80s, community supervision technology was of little consequence, since from a supervision point of view, there was only one choice — to use electronic monitoring (ankle bracelets) or not. Today, with the introduction of various supervisory enhancement technologies, community corrections professionals have been given the opportunity for choice. No longer are they in the “Catch-22” situation of one size must fit all.

However, as interesting and appealing as this new flexibility may be, the chilling winds of reality quickly cool any enthusiasm. First, the successful use of this new technology opportunity rests squarely on what we learned in “Community Corrections 101.” Namely, its success or failure rests squarely on the community corrections officer being able to classify his/her caseload and thereby differentially manage it. With 150 or more individuals for whom he is personally responsible, even though he believes this new technology will help him more effectively perform his/her job, there isn’t the time to do the type of classification the success of the technology demands. There is no question that with voice

verification and the existing telephone networks, the case officer can far more effectively and economically track an offender's compliance with his/her agreed upon program. There is no question for one's higher risk offenders who are on electronic monitoring house arrest for a portion of their day, that it makes little sense not to track them while they are away from their little black box. But the decisions that these and other offender supervision programs make available, require time and a commitment from management which in many cases the case manager lacks.

At least equally telling in this picture is the ever present judgmental, condemnatory public. Without laying the blame at anyone's doorstep, the public's general perception of electronic monitoring is that the individual offender is "locked up in his house." The fact is that a very high percentage of these individuals are away from the transmitting device anywhere from twelve to fourteen hours a day. With the public relations difficulties this misperception has already had, the community corrections official has little motivation to highlight that he/she needs to rely on technology to accomplish his/her supervision responsibilities. If anything were to happen, it would simply further crystallize the public's impression that the staff isn't doing its job. Of course, the public doesn't understand that with burgeoning caseloads, offender supervision in the community has, to a large measure, become supervision by exception!

The Growing Role of the Private Sector

The second area which has been impacted by these truisms is the growing prominence of the private provider. The evolution of the private sector's role in institutional corrections has been spurred by several factors, but far and above the most influential has been the financing enhancements on the capital side of the equation. For local and state governments, the most important of which is the Real Estate Investment Trusts. Regardless of the short or long term fiscal implications, the privatization of jail and prison facilities is growing apace.

Since community corrections enterprise is driven by the private community corrections enterprise is driven by one or more program and/or system delivery factors. In all cases, the entry of the private sector into community corrections is focusing on doing the task, the program or the entire operation more effectively, efficiently and for less money, and in some cases it has been the willing outside party to do some unwanted task, i.e., fee collection. In either case, the role of the professional is questioned and legitimate expectations of his/her program responsibilities are selectively chipped away. If, in fact, the private sector can more cost effectively deliver an acceptable program, then the professional community corrections case managers had better determine why and how that is possible. If it is because the private operator is using some or all of the various technologies, which for the reasons noted above the case management staff has shunted aside, then the task at hand is obvious.

Another aspect of the continuing involvement of privatized community corrections is the selective impact which this can have on the premise which underlies case management theory. Namely, that one's case load comprises several subgroups which demand different levels and types of supervision. When one delegates an entire segment of his/her caseload to a third party

provider, he/she has restricted the ability to balance the time demands possible with a heterogeneous caseload. This is certainly not to diminish the importance of the research which has been done in the area of intensive supervision as applied to sex offender and other high risk offender groups. However, even within these population groups, there is the opportunity for differential case management which could be complemented by the appropriate use of technology, not to mention the benefits which can accrue to the officer whose work situation has some semblance of variety.

The increasing prominence of the private sector in community corrections is causing many of us to rethink even the smallest program delivery issues. That's good because it has reminded every community corrections professional of his/her obligation to the criminal justice system to clearly define the role of a comprehensive community corrections program. In such an environment, one must consider the most cost effective and programmatically sound delivery system. In so doing, the real program performance objectives by which any service provider, be he/she public or private, must be measured are made very explicit. As an added benefit, this will facilitate a much better understanding by the decision makers as to the role the private providers really want to play.

Interagency Cooperation and Not Competition

Because we are slowly but surely recognizing that human intervention can best and most economically occur at the community level, and because of the significant increases in caseloads, we have seen a plethora of new and expanded agencies. The single most debilitating thing that can occur within community corrections is for one or more of its components to start competing for position and/or funding. This simply plays into the hands of those who keep the field of community corrections off balance by giving high profile support to the newest team member to appear.

There are two factors those in community corrections must wake up to and develop a cooperative strategy to address. First, probation and parole represent less than 10 percent of the corrections' budget and with the recent building binge, that percentage will continue to decrease unless all components of community corrections address this disparity of funding in unison. As a former commissioner of corrections, this writer knows all too well the risk of under funding institutional security as compared to continuing a "no growth" budget for the community programs. Regardless of how persuasive the director of probation and parole is, he/she will seldom succeed in overcoming this "risk" argument. The strongest position is to call attention to the disproportionate number of minimum secure, nonviolent offenders occupying the limited bed space in the prisons and the number of these individuals who are backed up or being sent back to the local jail. In properly structured coordinated community programs, these individuals, most of whom are drug users, can be more economically handled and with a much higher rate of success at the community level in a non institutional setting.

Secondly, we must recognize and act on the fact that the general public has little or no idea what probation and parole does. In a study done by the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center at Sam Houston State University, 22 percent of those polled nationally didn't know enough about the function to

respond. One can call for a national education program, etc., but the most effective remedy for this dismal state of affairs is to achieve public education through examples of local and state cooperation of the "family" of community corrections efforts (agencies). It is essential that all components of a local and/or state community corrections program cooperate in developing and delivering a single public information message to the decision makers. The North Carolina Department of Corrections has taken a giant step in this direction by combining all of its community corrections agencies under the Department of Community Corrections.

The recent developments in technology are certainly not the only answer for the role community corrections must assume. But when properly applied, it can be the "glue" to weld the various delivery agencies together in demonstrating an accountable offender development program that works and for less money than other residential programs. For example: In Buncomb County, Asheville, North Carolina, the director of county planning used the day reporting center as the catalyst for implementing a unified offender tracking system that involves the probation, pretrial, the day-reporting center and the jail work release program. The project has already freed one staff position to be reassigned to direct program delivery. In another program in Lexington, Kentucky, the director of the detention facility took the initiative to introduce a technology, which while helping him relieve overcrowding, will be used by juvenile aftercare, the pretrial office and county probation to achieve program compliance accountability of their clients.

Conclusion

With the recent publication of the RAND Corporation report on drugs and community treatment, the community corrections professional has an excellent opportunity to proactively educate the public as to its composite mission and the priority which must be placed on offender program accountability. Reversing the truisms which so dictate the action of the community corrections professional is not a short term goal, but we must not continue inhibiting the proactive policy and practical changes which must occur at the community supervision level if it is to be the intervening force probation and parole were meant to be.

One of the most important factors to the success of drug courts has been the degree of accountability which is forced on the participating offender. There is no logical reason why, through the use of today's inexpensive program compliance tracking systems, that this same level of accountability can't be demanded of those on pretrial, probation, parole, extended furlough, etc. The public must be made to face the realities of having spent more than \$60 billion on prison construction in relationship to the crying needs of schools, healthcare, and local and state infrastructures. But that public will turn a deaf ear until those of us in community corrections can demonstrate real offender accountability.

Finally, the American Probation and Parole Association, the National Association of Probation Executives, and the National Association of Pretrial Administrators are already looking at how to better inform the public. As important as this is at the national level, it is multiplied a hundredfold at the local level. Local public information and education are enormously more successful when the effort has as its foundation, all the key players in that local area.

PUTTING THE COMMUNITY BACK INTO COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

by
Gary Hinzman
Director
Sixth Judicial District Department
of Correctional Services
Cedar Rapids, Iowa

Introduction

The Sixth Judicial District Department of Correctional Services serves multiple counties in the east central part of Iowa, as a district level community corrections entity. Iowa was the nation's first Community Corrections Act state and the Sixth District provides a full range of pretrial, presentence, probation, and parole services as well as operating both pre-institutional and post-institutional residential facilities. In 1992, the Sixth District created its own private, non-profit foundation called the Community Corrections Improvement Association (CCIA). The foundation operates many educational, prevention, and restorative programs which provide about one million dollars worth of services annually to the communities in the district.

Strategies

In the spring of 1997, the CCIA Board of Directors voted to create a Commission on Community Justice. The charge from the board was to:

1. Define what community justice meant in relation to community corrections, community policing, restorative justice, community mobilization, capacity building, neighborhood partnering and collaboration, etc.
2. Explore and research what was going on across the country in reference to community justice and/or restorative justice concepts or programs.
3. Find out what Iowans knew and understood about community justice and restorative justice concepts, what Iowans understood (versus perceived) about crime trends and sentencing policy in Iowa, upon which criteria public policy pertaining to crime was made, and if current policies contributed to the overall wellness and safety of Iowa's communities.

Several strategies were developed to seek answers to the questions CCIA had articulated (a more detailed account can be found in an upcoming edition of *Perspectives*, the journal of the American Probation and Parole Association):

1. CCIA commissioned a panel of state and national experts to tour Iowa and conduct public hearings to initiate dialogue and obtain feedback from Iowa constituents.
2. An exit survey was developed by Doble and Associates, Inc. of New Jersey in consultation with staff of CCIA and the Sixth District. The results of this survey ultimately supported the anecdotal comments heard during the public hearings.
3. CCIA, with technical assistance from the National Institute of Corrections, sponsored a one day workshop in Cedar

Rapids on the topic of Community and Restorative Justice. Presentation teams from Spokane, Washington, Phoenix (Maricopa County), Arizona, Knoxville, Tennessee, and Madison, Wisconsin explained initiatives in their respective communities that were based upon community justice principles.

What the Community Had to Say

The survey convincingly showed that Iowans had several misperceptions about crime related issues. For example:

1. They perceived that both violent and non-violent crime were increasing. In reality, both have been on the decline for each of the past five years.
2. They felt that convicted criminals were getting out of prison early, when in fact life means life in Iowa, and Iowa also has a punishing 85% law.

Iowans also showed some confusion over the criminal justice system:

1. They wanted offenders to be punished for their crimes. However, many identified pay back and community works projects as punishment.
2. They felt that the effect of a prison sentence actually makes a person more dangerous at the time of their release.
3. Participants wanted to make much greater use of community-based sanctions or alternative sentences.

Consistent with other work Doble and Associates have completed in many states around the country (especially Vermont), Iowans seem to be expecting the following from the criminal justice system:

1. They want safety from violent crime.
2. They want offenders to be held accountable.
3. They want offenders to repair the damage.
4. They want offender treatment for a safe release.
5. They want to be involved in the decision making process.

The Sixth District's Response

The Sixth District has been responsive by "putting the community back into community corrections." The District has set a course to work with the community, and to no longer just do things for them or to them. Our joint vision is to create a community where there are fewer victims in the future by:

1. Creating a system that has participation from victims and the community.
2. Introducing offenders into an environment that has pro-social supports and structure.
3. Developing enhanced partnerships between community corrections and law enforcement.
4. Creating enhanced partnerships between community corrections and penal institutions.
5. Providing enhanced services to assess, diagnose, treat, and supervise offenders.
6. Increasing collaboration with courts and the parole board to improve systems approach.
7. Utilizing technology to create an interactive system which provides comprehensive information and resources to stakeholders.

8. Creating a comprehensive communications campaign to make citizens aware of innovative and effective programs options.

For each of the eight listings above the Sixth Judicial District Department of Correctional Services established an advisory board or task force comprised of members of the community and supported by a diagonal slice of the agency's staff to develop comprehensive strategic plans. For example, in item five listed above a community group of educators, treatment, and mental health professionals guided the Sixth District to create a specialized Client Services Unit, which:

1. Has been listed in 1998 by the American Corrections Association as one of the nation's "best practices."
2. Has been instrumental in guiding the development of the Sixth District's computerized assessment process to place offenders in appropriate treatment and supervision tracks. The "Matrix Project" was recently presented in a workshop at the Annual Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association in Norfolk, Virginia.

In item one listed above, a Community Justice Task Force of nearly thirty interested community participants have worked for over a year to develop a vision statement, a mission statement, core values and beliefs, and action areas to make the vision a reality in their neighborhoods.

In response to a number of the issues listed above, the Sixth District has guided the development of a neighborhood, place-based operation working with both law enforcement and human service providers out of the same office setting in a local neighborhood.

Summary

The process of "putting the community back into community corrections" is an ongoing and continuously evolving process that has no ending point. It remains pliable and flexible to meet the needs of a complex society. One of the greatest gains for the agency is sharing responsibility with the community. By having more direct involvement, the community understands the nuances of the system and realizes that there are not any quick-fix solutions to create a system that strives to do what works and to have fewer victims in the future.

The Sixth District will continue to put the community back into community corrections.

Gary Hinzman, a member of the Board of Directors of the National Association of Probation Executives, presented these remarks at the Association's Annual Awards Breakfast in Norfolk, Virginia, on August 30, 1998.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

LARGE TURNOUT FOR NAPE EVENTS IN NORFOLK

On August 29, 1998, over 80 community corrections professionals attended the NAPE reception held at the Sheraton Waterside Hotel in Norfolk, Virginia. On the following morning, approximately 55 community corrections executives attended the Association's Annual Awards Breakfast, where **Richard E. Wyett** was presented with the Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year Award.



NAPE Executive of the Year with friends. Pictured, from left to right, are: **Dan Richard Beto**, Vice President; **Robert L. Bingham**, President; **Cindy Wyett**; Executive of the Year **Richard E. Wyett**; **George M. Keiser**, Chief of the Community Corrections Division of the National Institute of Corrections; and **Rick Faulkner** with the National Institute of Corrections.

During the breakfast **Gerald R. Hinzman**, Director of the Sixth Judicial District Department of Correctional Services in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, delivered an exclusive presentation to NAPE members on the subject of "Bringing Community Back Into Community Corrections."

The Annual Awards Breakfast was sponsored by **Corrections Software Corporation**, a new corporate member of the Association.

BEXAR COUNTY FIRST IN TEXAS TO PERMIT FIREARMS FOR PROBATION OFFICERS

Recent articles in the *Dallas Morning News* and the *San Antonio Express-News* report that officers of the Bexar County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in San Antonio, Texas, became the first in the state to be authorized to carry firearms while on duty.

"This is history-making. This is going to put some teeth into our department," said **Caesar Garcia**, Bexar County's Chief Probation Officer. Bexar County officials stressed that not all probation officers want to carry guns and not all will be allowed to. "In our department, we have ex-priests and former cops; we have retired military and people who never wore a uniform. Only 60 to 70 officers will be eligible to carry a handgun," said **Ed Castart**, Bexar County's Deputy Chief

Probation Officer. "Each will undergo a psychological evaluation and a separate background check; in addition, each will undergo extensive handgun training."

"In the past few years, more and more officers have been threatened, harassed, and assaulted by probationers and parolees," Garcia said. He added that armed officers will feel safer and will be able to more closely monitor their probationers.

"We see this as just another tool that probation officers have, along with home visits and electronic monitoring equipment, to help us do our job," added Castart.

CURFEW CHECKS IN NUECES COUNTY, TEXAS

Noveida Sommers, a reporter for the *Corpus Christi Caller-Times*, wrote an excellent article on a new supervision initiative of the Nueces County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Corpus Christi, Texas; the article, which appeared in the June 24, 1998, edition, is found in part below.

After dark they go calling — uninvited, unannounced, and often unwelcome.

On Friday night, probation officer **Ruben Cantu** dropped by a sex offender's home. Cantu knocked on the door as Nueces County sheriff's deputies walked around to the sides and back of the darkened house, shining flashlights in windows, watching for movement. By court order the sex offender was supposed to be home by 9:00 p.m. An hour past curfew, no one answered the pounding on the door. Probation officers later found the offender was living at another address, and his probation requirements were toughened for not reporting it.

Probation officers, accompanied by deputies with the sheriff's gang unit, have made 79 such visits since February to probationers with court ordered curfews. Fifty-one, or about 65% have been caught breaking their curfews, which range from 9:00 p.m. to midnight, said **Carolina Balli-Kolpack**, Supervisor of the Nueces County Community Supervision and Corrections Department's Gang Unit. All violators have been taken to court, and punishments have ranged from more stringent conditions to jail, she said.

"People have had the mind set for many years that the criminal justice system, other than law enforcement, operates 8-to-5," she said. "We are changing."

That change has come about as an increasing number of offenders are placed on probation instead of being sent to jails that are nearing capacity, said **Timothy J. Flanagan**, Dean of the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University. "More rigorous enforcement is needed," Flanagan said. "A more serious offender is on probation, and the more serious the offense, the less likely it is that the offender will successfully complete probation."

In Nueces County, the average probationer is in his late-teens and early 20s, and is becoming more violent, said **Eddie Gonzalez**, Director of the Nueces County Community Supervision and Corrections Department. "Probation can no longer be thought of as a slap on the wrist," Gonzalez said.

About 80,000 Nueces County residents, or about 2.7% of the population, are on probation. About 80% of those successfully complete probation.

Partnerships like the one between the sheriff's and probation departments are becoming more common across the

county, Flanagan said, because they make it easier for police and probation departments to share gang intelligence. And for probation officers in jurisdictions where the officers don't carry weapons, as in the case of Nueces County, the law enforcement officers also provide protection in the company of convicted felons, Flanagan added. "It's a risky profession," he said. "If the probation officer is going out doing surveillance at night, going into bad neighborhoods, clearly it's risky."

Nueces County probation officials modeled their curfew check program after Boston's Operation Night Light, in which probation officers joined forces with police to keep gang offenders with curfews off the streets at night, Gonzalez said.

Ronald P. Corbett, Jr., Deputy Commissioner of Massachusetts Probation, said the program, which began in 1992, contributed to Boston's decreasing crime rates and reduced fear of crime. Violent crime dropped 14% in 1997, and a police survey found that 75% of Boston's adult population feel safe walking in their neighborhoods at night. The city went 29 months without a juvenile homicide.

Departments from around the country have sought information about the Massachusetts program, and several a week visit to see how the program works, Corbett said. "There is no doubt in my mind this is a growing trend in the country."

NAPE MEMBERS PROVIDE TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TRAINING IN CALIFORNIA

On July 20-23, 1998, in San Luis Obispo, California, several members of the National Association of Probation Executives provided technical assistance training on executive development to a number of California Chief Probation Officers. This peer training, a modified version of the successful Executive Development Program for new probation executives, was a collaborative initiative of the National Institute of Corrections, National Association of Probation Executives, and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University.

Members of the faculty included **Dan Richard Beto** of Texas, Vice President of the Association; **Cherlyn K. Townsend** of Arizona, the Association's Secretary; and **Ron R. Goethals** of Texas and **Gerald R. Hinzman** of Iowa, both members of the Association's Board of Directors. **Rick Faulkner**, a Correctional Program Specialist with the National Institute of Corrections, coordinated this technical assistance effort.

Topics covered included "Working within the Organization," "Working in the Political Arena," "Strategic Planning," "Team Building," "Presentation Skills and Media Relations," and "Staff Safety." Also discussed were problem statements prepared by the participants.

WALTER DUNBAR MEMORIAL AWARD PRESENTED TO NANCY LICK

Nancy M. Lick, Chief of Research, Planning, and Staff Development with the Westchester County Probation Department in White Plains, New York, was presented the Walter Dunbar Memorial Award On September 1, 1998, at the 23rd Annual Training Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association held in Norfolk, Virginia.

The Walter Dunbar Memorial Award is the oldest APPA practitioner award; it is presented in honor of one of APPA's most distinguished colleagues, the late Walter Dunbar, who served as Director of the California Department of Corrections, Chairman of the U.S. Parole Commission, and Director of the New York State Division of Probation. The award is presented for significant contributions by a practicing professional in the field of probation or parole.

Lick, a member of the National Association of Probation Executives and a past President of the American Probation and Parole Association, has devoted over a quarter of a century to community corrections. After serving as APPA's first woman President, Lick continued to remain active in the Association, serving on the Position and Resolution Committee, Past Presidents Advisory Committee, Awards Committee, and the Prevention Committee.

In addition to her work in Westchester County and with APPA, Lick has been involved in the national arena on matters relating to criminal justice. She participated in the Curriculum Development Project of the National Institute of Corrections, the National Commission Against Drunk Driving, the American Bar Association's pretrial initiative, and the National Advisory Board to the National Sheriff's Association on Criminal Justice Management of High Risk Populations.

Because of a back injury, Lick was unable to attend the 1998 Annual Training Institute. Accepting the award on her behalf was **Rocco Pozzi**, Commissioner of the Westchester County Probation Department.

NAPE FRIEND RECEIVES THE UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI AWARD

During the Awards Luncheon held on September 1, 1998, at the 23rd Annual Training Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association in Norfolk, Virginia, **Timothy J. Flanagan**, former Dean of the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University, was named the recipient of the University of Cincinnati Award, presented to an individual who has made significant contributions to the probation and parole field. Recipients typically are individuals from an academic research or government agency not engaged in providing probation and parole services.

Flanagan has devoted his entire professional career to criminal justice education and research. He is widely published and has contributed articles to *Federal Probation*, *Executive Exchange*, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *The Prison Journal*, and *Corrections Management Quarterly*. In addition, he has contributed to a number of books on various criminal justice topics. From 1977 to 1991 Flanagan directed the project which produced the *Source Book for Criminal Justice Statistics* on behalf of the United States Department of Justice.

Flanagan is a true friend of community corrections and his work has favorably influenced probation and parole practices. Further, he has been a leader in fostering the important collaboration between academia and practitioners. He was instrumental in developing the secretariat relationship between the National Association of Probation Executives and Sam Houston State University. In addition, he played a significant role in the efforts of the National Institute of Corrections, the National Association of Probation Executives, and the Correctional Man-

agement Institute of Texas in the creation of a curriculum for newly appointed probation executives.

Because of his new job demands as Vice President of Academic Affairs at the State University of New York at Brockport, Flanagan was unable to personally accept the award. Receiving the award on his behalf was **Dan Richard Beto**, Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas.

GUEST EDITORS NAMED FOR EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

The following persons have volunteered to serve as guest editors of *Executive Exchange* for the next four issues: **Gerald R. Hinzman**, Fall 1998; **Robert L. Bingham**, Winter 1999; **Don R. Stiles** and **Cherlyn K. Townsend**, Spring 1999; and **Gerald R. Hinzman** and **Dan Richard Beto**, Summer 1999.

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; her address is as follows:

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

Executive Exchange is always interested in receiving news items about NAPE members and unsolicited articles on community corrections topics.

WAHL RECOGNIZED AT APPA

During the American Probation and Parole Association's Awards Luncheon on September 1, 1998, in Norfolk, Virginia, NAPE member **Ray Wahl** was presented a plaque by **Rick Faulkner** from the National Institute of Corrections. The occasion was Wahl's retirement from the Utah Department of Corrections, where he had served as Director of Field Operations.

Wahl, President-elect of the American Probation and Parole Association, was a founding member of the Executives of State Probation and Parole Network sponsored by the National Institute of Corrections. In presenting the plaque, Faulkner commented on Wahl's devotion and commitment to improving the criminal justice system.

Following his retirement from the Utah Department of Corrections, Wahl was named Director of Juvenile Probation in the state's judicial branch.

POZZI ASSUMES ADDITIONAL DUTIES

On September 4, 1998, Westchester County Executive **Andy Spano** announced the appointment of **Rocco A. Pozzi** as Westchester County's new Commissioner of Correction. Pozzi, who is also Commissioner of the Department of Probation, had been appointed acting Correction Commissioner by Spano in January. Pozzi will continue to serve as Commissioner of Probation, a position he has held for nine years.

"Rocco Pozzi is perfect for this job," Spano said. "With over 25 years of experience in the criminal justice field, he has the right background and commitment to give new direction to the county's correctional facility. I have seen what he has accomplished as Acting Commissioner, and I'm convinced the department is now on the right track."

Pozzi has worked in various governmental and private positions. Immediately prior to coming to Westchester County as Commissioner of Probation, he served as Deputy Chief Probation Officer with the Philadelphia County Adult Probation Department. He is a past President of the American Probation and Parole Association and in 1997 he was appointed by Governor **George E. Pataki** to the New York State Probation Commission. Pozzi, a member of NAPE, holds a master's degree in public administration from Temple University.

EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM HELD AT SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

On September 13-18, 1998, the National Institute of Corrections, National Association of Probation Executives, and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas delivered another Executive Development Program for new probation and parole executives at the George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center in Huntsville, Texas.

Program participants included **Edward Birkel** (Nebraska), **Carlos Concha** (Nevada), **Dorothy Faust** (Iowa), **Delbert Harrison** (West Virginia), **Robert Hopkins** (New Jersey), **Magdeline Jensen** (Arizona), **Michael Jordan** (Pennsylvania), **Robert L. Lewis** (Pennsylvania), **Kevin McHugh** (New Jersey), **Donald L. Parrish** (New Hampshire), **James Robinson** (Pennsylvania), **John H. Roller** (Pennsylvania), and **Edward W. Swart** (New York).

The faculty, all members of NAPE, was chaired by **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.** (Massachusetts), and included **Dan Richard Beto** (Texas), **Ron R. Goethals** (Texas), **Richard A. Kipp** (Pennsylvania), **Rocco A. Pozzi** (New York), and **Cheryln Townsend** (Arizona). **Rick Faulkner** with the National Institute of Corrections served as program manager and facilitator.

Staff support was provided by **Christie Haney** with the Correctional Management Institute of Texas, who is responsible for handling secretariat services for NAPE, and **David Epps** with the Criminal Justice Center's Information Technology Services. In addition, **David Davidson** with the Texas Department of Criminal Justice coordinated transportation for program participants.

In addition to the peer faculty, members of the faculty of the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University made presentations during the week. **Rolando del Carmen**, Distinguished Professor of Criminal Justice, spoke on legal liability issues facing community corrections administrators and **Dennis R. Longmire**, Director of the Center's Survey Research Program, discussed public perception of the criminal and juvenile justice systems and their components.

The next Executive Development Program will be held in Huntsville on March 28 to April 2, 1999. Newly appointed probation and parole executives interested in attending this program are encouraged to contact **Rick Faulkner** at the National Institute of Corrections; his telephone number is

Executive Exchange

(202) 307-3106, extension 138. In addition, members of NAPE who are aware of new executives in their respective areas of the country are urged to contact them and encourage them to apply for admission to this program.

NEW ASSOCIATION MEMBERS

Since the Spring 1998 issue of *Executive Exchange* was published, 16 new individual members have joined the Association; they are as follows:

Jay Carver, Trustee, Court Services and Offender Supervision, 800 K Street, N.W., Suite 1050, Washington, D.C. 20001.

Carlos Concha, Chief, Division of Parole and Probation, 1445 Hot Springs Road, Suite 104, Carson City, Nevada 89710.

Delbert Harrison, Director of Parole Services, Department of Corrections, 112 California Avenue, Building B, room 300, Charleston, West Virginia 25305.

Robert Hopkins, Chief Probation Officer, Monmouth County Probation Department, P.O. Box 1259, Freehold, New Jersey 07728.

Pamela S. Howitt, Deputy Administrator, Oakland County Probate Court, Family Division, 1200 North Telegraph Road, Pontiac, Michigan 48341.

Magdeline E. Jensen, Chief U.S. Probation Officer, District of Arizona, 100 South Church Avenue, Suite 9100, Tucson, Arizona 85701.

Michael Jordan, Chief Probation Officer, Luzerne County Adult Probation and Parole Department, County Courthouse, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania 18711.

W. Roland Knapp, Director, Maryland Division of Parole and Probation, 6776 Reisterstown Road, Suite 305, Baltimore, Maryland 21215.

Robert L. Lewis, Director, Erie County Adult Probation and Parole Department, 140 West Sixth Street, Erie, Pennsylvania 16501.

Kevin McHugh, Deputy Executive Director, Division of Parole and Community Programs, Department of Corrections, CN 863, Trenton, New Jersey 08625.

Donald L. Parrish, Director, Division of Field Services, Department of Corrections, P.O. Box 1806, Concord, New Hampshire 03302.

John P. Rhoads, Chief Probation Officer, Santa Cruz County Probation Department, P.O. Box 1812, Santa Cruz, California 95061.

James Robinson, Director, Office of Probation and Parole Services, Board of Probation and Parole, P.O. Box 1661, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

John H. Roller, Chief Adult Probation and Parole Officer, Adult Probation Department, 1 Courthouse Square, Carlisle, Pennsylvania 17103.

Edward W. Swart, Director, Broome County Probation Department, P.O. Box 1766, Binghampton, New York 13902.

Kirk Torgensen, Director of Adult Probation and Parole, Department of Corrections, 6100 South Fashion Boulevard, Suite 202, Murray, Utah 84107.

In addition to the individual members, **Corrections Software Corporation**, which provides management information systems to community corrections agencies, joined the Association as a corporate member. The address of that company is as follows:

James Redus, President, Corrections Software Corporation, 2499 Capital of Texas Highway, Suite B-101, Austin, Texas 78746.

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. The contents of articles or other materials contained in *Executive Exchange* do not reflect the endorsements, official attitudes, or positions of the Association 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 typed on 8½ by 11 inch paper, double-spaced, 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
George J. Beto 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 & Copy Center.

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 (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

