

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

SUMMER 2006

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

It has been my honor and privilege to serve as President of the National Association of Probation Executives for the last two years. During this time, NAPE has continued to serve the probation profession in the ways that we have been successful in the past. We have taken on some new challenges. In some cases we've succeeded in accomplishing our objectives; in others we have only partially attained our objectives.

NAPE has, at its core, been an organization that serves probation executives and uses these same executives as a resource to continually develop the leadership of our profession. During the last two years, we have continued to deliver our trademark "Orientation for New Probation Executives" in collaboration with the National Institute of Corrections and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas. In May 2006 representatives of the three partners for this initiative met to review feedback that has been received from past participants and the expectations of the National Institute of Corrections. This meeting resulted in a revised agenda that will be delivered for the first time in September 2006. The format for the program will continue to be facilitated discussions and highly participatory in nature. NAPE also worked with the NIC to make this program available to leaders of juvenile probation only agencies on a limited basis.

NAPE members have continued to plan and deliver workshops in the Leadership Track of the American Probation and Parole Association Annual Institutes. We have expanded our participation to include the Winter Institute as well as the Annual Institute. And, we have worked with our members to deliver these same types of programs internationally.

Two years ago we established a goal of strengthening our

partnerships and collaborative efforts with other organizations. We have been successful in attaining this goal. We held meetings with representatives of International Community Corrections Association, International Corrections and Prisons Association, Association of Women Executives in Corrections, American Probation and Parole Association, and the Association of Probation Officers of Wielkopolska. We agreed to exchange memberships in one another's organizations and reprints of our professional publications. We have and will continue to collaborate on major public policy.

We also established a goal of conducting a summit on Reinventing Probation – Five Years Later. We did conduct a survey of members to assist us in reexamining the past five years. And, we did conduct a summit to review the survey results and to determine the lessons learned. However, we have not yet published the results.

Finally, NAPE has continued to serve a professional community. We continue to have excellent member involvement. Our publication, *Executive Exchange*, continues to deliver timely, thought provoking, and helpful information to our membership. We have added the availability of an electronic version of our publication and regular reviews of publications regarding leadership. The NAPE listserv continues to receive the latest news regarding probation, community corrections, and leadership. And, our membership continues to be involved in influencing public policy at all levels.

As an organization NAPE continues to be strong and effective because we have focused on our passion for developing and supporting the

Continued on page 6



CONTENTS

President's Message, Cheryl K. Townsend	1
International Probation Conference: Sharing Information and Experiences in Poland, Dan Richard Beto, Mark Atkinson, Donald G. Evans, Gerald R. Hinzman, Paul Kosierowski, and Marshall A. Shelsy	2
What Society Wants from Probation, Dan Richard Beto	7
Probation and Police Partnerships, Donald G. Evans	10
Offender Reentry Programs Provide Solutions for a Safer Community, Gerald R. Hinzman	13
Developments in Probation in the United Kingdom, David Thomas	16
The Development of the Probation Service in Poland, Magdalena Niewiadomska, Ph.D.	18
From the Bookshelf	21
News from the Field	23

INTERNATIONAL PROBATION CONFERENCE: SHARING INFORMATION AND EXPERIENCES IN POLAND

by

Dan Richard Beto, Mark Atkinson, Donald G. Evans
Gerald R. Hinzman, Paul Kosierowski, and Marshall Shelsy
Members, North American Delegation to Poland

On May 22-30, 2006, a delegation comprised of probation and judicial professionals visited Poland at the invitation of the Association of Probation Officers of Wielkopolska, the Polish Ministry of Justice, and Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznan.



The North American Delegation, pictured from left to right: Marshall Shelsy, Dan Richard Beto, Gerald R. Hinzman, Donald G. Evans, Paul Kosierowski, and Mark Atkinson, far right, with Ewa Wozna-Plusa, Senior Probation Officer from Krosno Odrzanskie.

Delegation Organization and Members

The delegation was organized by the National Association of Probation Executives and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University and had as its members:

Dan Richard Beto, Chair of the Governing Board of the Texas Regional Center for Policing Innovation at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas, and a past President of the National Association of Probation Executives and the Texas Probation Association, who led the delegation;

Mark Atkinson, Judge of Harris County Criminal Court at Law No. 13 in Houston, Texas, and Chair of the Judicial Section of the American Probation and Parole Association;

Donald G. Evans, President of the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario, and a past President of the American Probation and Parole Association and the International Community Corrections Association;

Gerald R. Hinzman, Director of the 6th Judicial District Department of Correctional Services in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, and Vice President of the National Association of Probation Executives and President-elect of the American Probation and Parole Association;

Paul Kosierowski, Deputy Director of the Bexar County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in San Antonio, Texas; and

Marshall Shelsy, Staff Attorney with the Harris County Criminal Courts at Law in Houston, Texas.

During our stay in Poland, we had as our escorts representatives of the Ministry of Justice and the Probation Service. Particularly helpful were Dr. Magdalena Niewiadomska, Main Specialist with the Probation Section of the Department of Enforcement of Judgments and Probation in the Ministry of Justice, and Anna Kosterkiewicz-Kwiatkowska, a probation officer in Poznan, who served as our interpreters, responded to our questions, and offered suggestions regarding local customs. Also traveling with us and who crafted our program was Piotr Burczyk, President of the Association of Probation Officers of Wielkopolska.

International Probation Conference

The primary purpose of our trip was to attend the International Probation Conference at Mielno, situated on the Baltic coast. Speakers at the three day conference and their topics included:

Peter Burczyk, President of the Association of Probation Officers of Wielkopolska and a probation administrator in Poznan, presided over the conference;

Judge Katarzyna Pawlicka with the Ministry of Justice welcomed participants and identified conference expectations;

Michal Laskowski, Chief Justice of the District Court in Poznan, provided a judicial perspective on community corrections;

Dr. Wieslaw Ambrozik, Dean of the Faculty of Educational Studies at Adam Mickiewicz University, discussed the "essence and scope of current re-socialization and social re-adaptation";

Dan Richard Beto of Texas spoke on "what society expects from probation";

Gerald R. Hinzman from Iowa presented a paper dealing with offender reentry;

David Thomas, a probation administrator from the United Kingdom, spoke on the effects of the implementation of new legislation for probation services;

Dr. Peter Stepniak, Professor of Penitentiary Studies at Adam Mickiewicz University, had as his topic "probation – ideal model versus social reality";

Donald G. Evans of Canada discussed probation and police partnerships;

Judge Magdalena Kociorska presented a paper on the supervision of juveniles by the courts and probation in Poland;

Col. Włodzimierz Kosterkiewicz, Regional Director of the Polish Prison Service in Poznan, presented on the role, both present and future, of the prison service in the release of offenders;

Superintendent Beata Krzeszewska with the Polish National Police had as her topic "police and court probation officers partnerships – situation today and prospects for the future"; and

Judge Piotr Hajduk spoke on the legal aspects of offender reentry as defined by Polish Penal Law.

Following the presentations participants were permitted to ask the speakers questions. During the question and answer periods, we all had opportunities to field questions about probation in the United States and Canada.



Pictured from left to right: Piotr Burczyk, President of the Association of Probation Officers of Wielkopolska; Col. Włodzimierz Kosterkiewicz, Regional Director of the Polish Prison Service; and Col. Robert Bulak, Director of the Jail at Poznan.

During the conference, Beto presented Texas House Resolution No. 39, introduced by Representative Jerry Madden, Chairman

of the House Corrections Committee, which commended the Correctional Management Institute of Texas, Texas Probation Association, the Polish Ministry of Justice, and the Association of Probation Officers of Wielkopolska for their concerted efforts in forging cooperative relationships between Texas and Poland. In addition, on behalf of Cheryl K. Townsend, President of the National Association of Probation Executives, Beto presented Piotr Burczyk a certificate making the Association of Probation Officers of Wielkopolska an organizational member of NAPE.

It was also during the conference that Beto was presented with a proclamation from the Polish Ministry of Justice commending him for his efforts of several years to bring together criminal justice professionals from the United States and Poland.

Related Activities

At the conclusion of the conference, we traveled to Poznan, where we received a briefing by Judge Laskowski and several of his colleagues. During that meeting Judge Atkinson and Judge Laskowski signed an agreement creating a formal relationship between the Courts of Wielkopolska and the Judicial Section of the American Probation and Parole Association. In signing the agreement, Atkinson commented:

It is with great pleasure that I sign this agreement on behalf of the Judicial Section of the American Probation and Parole Association. This agreement formalizes a relationship that has its roots in London in 2004 and that has continued to grow over the past two years. While I am pleased to sign this agreement, I know that it is meaningless without the mutual friendship, trust, respect, and spirit of cooperation that is shared by the people in this room. It is my hope that this agreement will serve as a foundation for other similar relationships between the Republic of Poland and the United States of America.

This latest agreement is similar in nature to one entered into last year involving the Central Board of Prison Service, the Institutional Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas. In addition, also in 2005 agreements were executed by representatives of the National Association of Probation Executives and the Texas Probation Association with the Association of Probation Officers of Wielkopolska.



Judges Mark Atkinson and Michal Laskowski at signing of cooperation agreement.

While in Poznan, we spent time with Irena Szostak, District Director of Probation for the District Court of Poznan, and members of her staff discussing common community corrections issues. We also attended a briefing conducted by Col. Włodzimierz Kosterkiewicz, Regional Director of the Prison Service in Poznan, and Col. Robert Bulak, Director of the Jail at Poznan; in addition, we were provided a tour of the facility.

Executive Exchange



Pictured, from left to right: Piotr Burczyk, President of the Association of Probation Officers of Wielkopolska; Col. Kosterkiewicz, Regional Director of the Prison Service; and Piotr Stepinak, Professor at Adam Mickiewicz University at Poznan.

We also visited Gdansk, where we met with the Chief Justice of the District Court and two other judges, and District Director of Probation Irena Hamryszak and several of her officers.

While in Gdansk, Beto had an opportunity to renew acquaintances with Col. Dr. Jerzy Czolgoszewski and Col. Jan Dzierwowski with the Central Board of the Polish Prison Service, who traveled from Warsaw to meet with him to discuss a variety of issues.



Pictured with Dan Richard Beto (center), are Jan Dzierwowski, Legal Advisor, and Jerzy Czolgoszewski, Director of the Presidential Bureau, Central Board of Prison Service.

In addition to participating in the conference and attending meetings, our gracious Polish hosts provided opportunities for us to visit historical sites in Gdansk, Sopot, Poznan, Kornik, and Malbork.

Observations by the Delegates

Donald G. Evans: I was privileged to be invited to join a delegation organized by Dan Beto comprising five other members of NAPE and APPA to visit Poland and participate in the International Probation Conference organized by the Association of Probation Officers of Wielkopolska. While in Poland we also visited two courts, a prison, and met with probation staff in two cities, Gdansk and Poznan. The following summarizes my experiences of probation in Poland in terms of three major lessons that I personally learned.

Respect for their Probation History. I was impressed by the respect shown by the Polish probation officials for their history. Probation in Poland is nearly 100 years old. The early versions of probation were staffed by volunteers and had a general welfare orientation. The recent political changes in Poland have found them revising their probation service and creating a professional service with professional well-trained officers.

Researching the Present. The second lesson I learned by my experience in Poland relates to the dedication and determination of Polish probation to seek to be the best probation service in Europe. To this end they have embarked on an ambitious program of reaching out to other jurisdictions to learn what works and what doesn't. Using the filter of their own experiences and culture they are selecting aspects of probation that fit their own situation and circumstances. There seems to be no complacency in their view of Polish probation and they all exhibited a desire to learn and share knowledge and best practices. I wish probation at home had the same approach to information and knowledge from other jurisdictions. We have much to learn as well as contribute to probation in a globalized world.

Recognizing the Future. The final lesson I took away from my engagement with probation officials and staff in Poland was their commitment to enhancing and improving their service with an eye on not only reducing re-offending but in improving the quality of life of offenders in the process. Public safety was the goal but it was not a short-term approach but one situated in a longer view of what was necessary to ensure community safety. The ability to hold in creative tension the goals of offender supervision, welfare, and community safety is, I believe, the hallmark of the Polish Probation Service. To this end they demonstrate remarkable insight and imagination in their efforts.

I find that meeting with probation services in other jurisdictions and countries allows me to see North American probation with another set of lenses. Given the similarity of social and crime problems in these other countries it is helpful to study their responses to the same set of problems we are dealing with. This comparative perspective sometimes leads to innovative approaches here at home.

Mark Atkinson: I was recently privileged to be a member of a North American delegation to Poland, the goal of which was to share knowledge of our two criminal justice systems. The specific areas of focus were probation, parole, and the eventual reintegrating of offenders into society. I had assumed (wrongly) that the Poles would be looking to us for guidance. What I encountered, instead, was a fully developed system of supervision for both probationers and parolees. In addition, the officials we met, from probation officers to judges to prison administrators were impressive in their high level of professionalism. In our numerous meetings with Polish officials, our delegation was encouraged to participate in

discussions, but we were not necessarily looked to for solutions.

I learned, from a quick and cursory study of Polish history and culture, that the Poles are a very independent-minded people. The same goes for their attitude toward their criminal justice system. They are a warm, hospitable, and open minded society; and they listen to others' ideas. But, they will always end up with a Polish solution. This approach shows itself in the tension felt as Poland becomes more and more entwined in the European Union. The Poles talk of the tradeoffs of relative values, economic gain versus loss of independence.

The Poles have a post-Communist constitution which has the guarantees of individual liberties found in the United States and other modern, democratic documents. They also have a modern penal code, with accompanying criminal procedures. The Poland I saw, in our 950-mile tour through rural and urban areas, was a rapidly modernizing nation, with freeways and Ikea stores, supermarkets, and modern gas stations. The demographic we saw was young. The population is 97% ethnic Polish, and overwhelming Catholic. Their probation sanctions are much cognizant of the needs of the family, both of the victim and the offender.

The Poland of the 21st Century looks to be a free, prosperous nation, blessed with a beautiful landscape, and a warm-hearted, hardworking people. I encourage any and all to travel to this wonderful country.

Gerald R. Hinzman: Traveling to Poland with my colleges turned out to be a remarkable experience. The Poles are earnest in seeking the best possible justice system. They have the opportunity to invite professionals from various parts of the world and select the right fit for their situation. Their spirit and passion for their work is evident as they forge a new justice system.

While visiting the historical gate at the shipyards in Gdansk that Lech Walesa climbed over, it was interesting to hear from our hosts their first hand accounts of that moment in time they had all lived through. Suddenly it struck me that this was comparable to visiting with people that had been involved in the Boston Tea Party. I knew then that these people had paid the price for liberty and they would also create the best justice system possible. It is little wonder Poland is such a friend and close ally of the American people.

Throughout the visit we found the Poles to be kind and gracious hosts. Along with Dan Beto and Don Evans I was pleased to be able to address the International Probation Conference in Mielno, with hopes that our comments proved helpful to them. Visiting their field offices and jails in Gdansk and Poznan was a great opportunity.

It was the Poles themselves that made this trip a pleasure. They are wonderful, hard-working people with a passion for their country, their church, and their regained freedom.

I look forward to assisting them in coming to the United States. We discussed their participation in the APPA Summer Institute in Philadelphia and they are anxious to work with us in the future. We have been presented a wonderful opportunity to build on the relationships previously forged with our Polish colleagues!

Paul Kosierowski: The facts are known. Since 1939, Poland has experienced six years of Nazi occupation, 44 years of Soviet occupation, and the past 17 years as an independent nation. How advanced could their courts and probation system be? What knowledge could I bring to share with them? The trip would only be ten days. We had so much information to share. Where

could we begin? Being a second generation Polish-American, what would I learn of the "old country" so often spoken of during my childhood?

As dawn broke over the Baltic Sea that first morning, I viewed the day with a sense of foreboding. I had never been this far from American soil. The conference site was a former Soviet training camp now under the control of the Polish National Police. Did they say that Hitler visited this area once? A sense of the surreal seemed to permeate the air.

Soon after attaching the simultaneous translation earpiece, all apprehension was shattered by the clarity of the passion in the language. The regional director of probation spoke with pride about how the university system supported the probation profession with a dedicated course of studies. The profession of a probation officer is viewed with esteem and respect. One region has 300 individuals on a waiting list to be hired as probation officers.

This was not the difference I anticipated I would find. Yet, the differences were wonderful: the ability of adult probation officers to intervene with families; job placement, training, and education for offenders; and a system built around the rehabilitative needs of the offender and their return to society. What I felt from Polish colleagues was a passion that burns from within to bring individuals back into society so no one can be lost. The years under Nazi and Soviet rule seems to have taught the Polish probation system that each person has value and every effort must be taken to secure a place for them.

Of late the probation rhetoric in the United States has spoken of "getting back to basics," "best practices," and "what works." I crossed the Atlantic with an expectation of teaching and found myself being schooled in the basics. I've been to a place where passion for probation burns from within. For me, I believe I have many more probation lessons to learn from the land of amber, castles, vodka, and wonderful people.

Marshall A. Shelsy: The III International Conference hosted by the Association of Probation Officers for Wielkopolska provided international delegates with the opportunity to view first-hand the elements contributing to the ongoing development of a criminal justice system based on the collaborative efforts of the judiciary, probation, police, and prison officials. These elements include: 1) maintaining a unique "Polish" perspective [despite centuries of cyclic conquest, liberty, and re-occupation]; 2) a willingness to adopt pieces of another nation's criminal justice system [rather than accepting it in its entirety]; and 3) the use of pre and post-solidarity academic research conducted at Polish universities.

The Constitution of 1997 that created The Third Republic of Poland established an independent judiciary overseeing an inquisitorial similar to those in Europe rather than an adversarial system like that in the United States. Subsequently, the penal code and code of criminal procedure abandoned the single-minded restrictive approach embodied by long periods of detention without early release for a system based on a range of non-custodial sentences and discretionary sanctions. To do so the judiciary relies heavily on a highly trained cadre of probation officers who work with the Polish Prison Service. These professionals are responsible for developing a plan whose primary goal is the reintegration of the offender into society with the skills and social values that will reduce the likelihood of future criminal conduct.

Ongoing development of supervision strategies and correctional practices occurs at international conferences with repre-

Executive Exchange

representatives from other nations. Academic and criminal justice professionals like Professor Piotr Stepniak of the University of Adam Mickiewicz, Piotr Burczyk, President of the Association of Probation Officers of Wielkopolska, and Col. Włodzimierz Kosterkiewicz, Regional Director of the Polish Prison Service, present their research theories and practical experiences to peer groups of Polish and foreigner professionals such as ourselves. Moderated discussions provide feedback, and informal discussions among participants are encouraged through social events. As was the case with our delegation, this leads to the formation of relationships based on mutual professional respect and friendship.

If developments over the past decade are indicators of the future, Poland's criminal justice system will continue to evolve into one that meets the expectations of its society and that serves as a model for other young republics.

Dan Richard Beto: This recent trip to Poland marked my fourth official visit to this wonderful country. Since my previous visits were occasioned by invitations from the Polish National Police and the Polish Central Board of Prison Service, this was the first time I was able to devote much attention to the courts and probation service.

The International Probation Conference at Mielno, located on the Baltic coast, was extremely well organized. The presentations were relevant and timely, and the venue was excellent. The representatives of the Association of Probation Officers of Wielkopolska, Adam Mickiewicz University at Poznan, and the Polish Ministry of Justice all have reason to be proud of their efforts in designing and delivering such a successful conference.

During our visit to Gdansk, we were provided a thorough briefing by judges and probation officials. They presented a system of justice that was thoughtfully developed, focused on individual rights, and comprehensive in its approach. Everyone with whom

we came into contact was professional in demeanor, committed to doing the best job possible, and open to discussing alternative strategies in the delivery of probation services.

What really struck me, however, was the passion exhibited by the young probation officers for their job. This was not just a job to them, it was their life's work. Despite the fact their caseloads averaged around 250, the officers saw their offenders at least once a month. Of the contacts, 80% were in the home or field, and only 20% were in the office. The officers typically worked 50-60 hours a week, usually with two days in the office and three in the field. They reported that approximately 40% of the offenders on their caseloads were unemployed. Their work ethic and passion for the job could well serve as exemplars for others to emulate.

A similar briefing took place in Poznan, where we had the opportunity to meet with judges and probation officials. In addition to learning more about their system of justice, we had candid discussions about issues common to Poland, the United States, and Canada. In varying degrees we have similar problems — prison overcrowding, limited resources, and unemployment.

We Texans take pride in our "Texas hospitality," but we could learn from our Polish colleagues. The kindnesses they extended to us and their generous hospitality were second to none. The time we spent in Poland was a truly rewarding, enjoyable, and enlightening experience.

As our world grows smaller, as cultural differences become less defined, as we witness a globalization of crime and justice issues, and as impediments to crossing borders diminish, we have a real opportunity to reach out to other countries to exchange information and to create meaningful coalitions. The relationships we have developed with representatives of the Polish criminal justice system represent an excellent example of what can be done and what should be done.

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE *cont'd*

leadership of our profession. We continue to contribute what each of us is best at and have allocated both the financial and human resources of our association to support our goals. It sounds a lot like the "Hedgehog Concept" described in *Good to Great* by Jim Collins. Mr. Collins has now published a monograph entitled, *Good to Great and the Social Sectors* (2005). In this monograph he writes, "...the fact remains, we can find pockets of greatness in nearly every difficult environment—whether it be the airline industry, education, healthcare, social ventures, or government-funded agencies. Every institution has its unique set of irrational and difficult constraints, yet some make a leap while others *facing the same environmental challenges* do not. This is perhaps the single most important point in all of *Good to Great*. Greatness is not a function of circumstance. Greatness, it turns out, is largely a matter of conscious choice, and discipline."

Our profession can certainly be described as a difficult environment. As leaders, we are faced with difficult situations daily. The greatness of NAPE and each of our organizations, then, is a matter of conscious choice and discipline. And, as leaders, it continues to be our responsibility to make certain the *right* decisions are made to achieve that greatness.

I look forward to continuing to serve NAPE in any way that our new President, Rocco Pozzi, identifies will be helpful to the association. I will continue to serve on the NAPE Board of Directors as past-President for two years. NAPE has afforded me many opportunities over the years to grow and to contribute to my chosen profession. The last two years are no exception. Thank you.

Cheryl K. Townsend
President

WHAT SOCIETY WANTS FROM PROBATION

by

Dan Richard Beto
 Chair, Governing Board
 Texas Regional Center for Policing Innovation
 Sam Houston State University
 Huntsville, Texas

This presentation was delivered at the International Probation Conference held in Mielno, Poland, on May 24-26, 2006.

Introduction

It is truly a pleasure to be back in the Republic of Poland, the home of some of my ancestors. This particular visit marks the fourth time I have been to Poland since the turn of the century, and I always look forward to my time here.

During the past several years I have developed close relationships with representatives of the Polish National Police and the Central Board of Correctional Services, and, more recently, with the Ministry of Justice and the Polish Probation Service. I cherish these relationships and hope they will continue to flourish for the foreseeable future.

I would be remiss if I did not commend the organizers of this conference for its theme — *Probation Today and Perspectives for the Future Based on Social Expectations*. This is such an important topic.

It is crucial that when attempting to move an organization forward, those in positions of authority should know: 1) their origin, from where they are starting; 2) where they want to go; 3) how they plan to get there; and, most importantly, 4) what do their customers — in this case, society — value.

I hope that my brief remarks on what society wants from probation will provide some insights that will assist you in better positioning the Polish Probation Service.

The Problem

It is my sense those agencies that comprise the criminal justice system have given amazingly little attention to the question of what the public wants. This is due in good measure to what my colleague, Ron Corbett, Executive Director of the Massachusetts Supreme Judicial Court, and who served as Chair of the Manhattan Institute's Reinventing Probation Council, refers to as our "monopoly" status. We don't have to attract customers — they come to us uninvited — so we are most often indifferent to their views.



Dan Richard Beto

Unfortunately, not only are we most often indifferent to society's views, we are, at times, openly antagonistic in receiving or soliciting community input. I am reminded of a former colleague of mine — a chief probation officer in Texas — who said on more than one occasion: "I don't care what the community wants. I know what is best for my jurisdiction." He is not alone in that view.

Sadly, it is this type of attitude that has marginalized probation's fragmented efforts to govern itself, to engender public support, and to have a significant impact on correctional policy.

If the probation profession is to be successful, it needs to abandon its reluctance to reach out to the community. One such method of engaging the community is, using Dr. Corbett's example, employing the "next door neighbor test," which poses the following questions: Do you, as a probation practitioner, have any idea what your next door neighbors know about probation? What would they most want probation to accomplish on their behalf? And, what specific probation practices would persuade them that your agency is aligned with their values?

If the probation profession lacks the knowledge to honestly answer these questions, not only is it an indication of a failure to solicit society's expectations, it also suggests that probation has done a poor job of marketing what it does.

Survey Results

We in the United States have a fascination with public opinion polls. Not a day goes by that a number of organizations — both public and private — are not conducting surveys on some aspect of American life.

The results of these surveys, particularly those that relate to the criminal justice system, suggest that the American public lacks sufficient knowledge as to probation's mission and, for those members of society who do possess an awareness, they lack confidence in probation's ability to deliver on that mission. Likewise, they are concerned that probation's mission is not aligned with their values.

These opinion polls, in addition to assessing the public's satisfaction and levels of knowledge of the various components of the criminal justice system, provide a clear picture of what society does want.

The public wants safety from crime, and particularly violent crime.

In this respect, the public's needs are very basic, though perhaps difficult to achieve. They want to be reassured that probation operates first and foremost to promote public safety. They want to be able to walk around the block in the evenings without fear.

Executive Exchange

They want assurances their children can play at local parks and playgrounds safely, and that their schools are free of violence. If offenders are living in their neighborhoods, they want them supervised closely. And, they want a reduction in victimization.

The public wants offenders held accountable.

As a corollary to the principle of public safety, the public wants to see that our practices clearly deter reoffending through containment and modification of behavior. There must be meaningful supervision and a rapid response to violations of the conditions of probation.

Unfortunately, many of the more than four million offenders on probation in the United States have learned to expect two or more “free ones” — two or more free dirty urine screens, two or more failures to report, two or more curfew violations, two or more missed appointments for treatment, two or more new law violations — before anything of any consequence occurs. As a result, in many jurisdictions probation has become “the great enabler” when it comes to holding offenders accountable. While not intended, some probation departments and courts actually reward bad behavior due to ill-advised policies and practices.

The public wants offenders to pay back to society.

The public has an expectation that offenders will compensate victims and communities for their transgressions, either in actual or symbolic restitution, as in the case of community service work. In many jurisdictions in the United States, in addition to being ordered by the courts to pay a specific amount of restitution, offenders are frequently required to pay court costs, fines, court appointed attorney’s fees, presentence investigation fees, the cost of urinalysis and various forms of electronic monitoring, supervision fees, and many other financial assessments.

It is important to the public to see probationers compensate the individuals and communities they have harmed. This satisfies a fundamental moral obligation — making amends to those you have hurt.

The public is adamant that these assessments be paid in full and in a timely manner.

While the assessment of fees may satisfy society’s desire for restitution, we have witnessed in many jurisdictions that this practice has brought about some negative, unintended consequences. In addition to restitution, which is a legitimate assessment, many states are requiring offenders on probation to pay court costs and other fees as a method of balancing their budgets. As a result, American probation officers spend more time serving as collection agents than they do fulfilling their public safety role and trying to assist offenders to successfully complete a period of supervision.

In addition, many offenders on probation lead a marginal existence and, as such, can ill-afford to pay all that is required of them.

While I am in favor of requiring probationers to pay restitution and fees to support the criminal justice system, this practice must not reach the point that it is counterproductive to offender rehabilitation.

The public wants some form of punishment.

The public does not expect all offenders to be sentenced to a term of confinement, nor do they want that to occur, but they do want offenders to be penalized. They like the concept of curfews,

weekend jail sentences, electronic monitoring, drug testing, mandatory participation in programs, and home confinement.

Probation professionals have often ignored the concept of just desserts — the notion that bad behavior should have like consequences for the offender. The probation profession needs to be as comfortable with and supportive of the concept of punishment as an enlightened public is.

The public wants offenders to participate in meaningful treatment.

The public wants offenders to participate in treatment programs that address their criminogenic needs.

After it is reassured that there is surveillance and control in place, the public wants probation to take steps to turn offenders into law-abiding citizens by getting them “drug free and job ready.”

The probation system has a legal obligation to supervise offenders; in addition, the system has a moral obligation to provide opportunities to offenders to enhance their ability to succeed.

Succinctly stated, the public wants something good to come from a period of probation, and a combination of a rational supervision scheme and meaningful treatment will help in the furtherance of that goal.

The public wants a voice in the criminal justice process.

Not only does the public want a voice, it wants a voice that is heard and respected in the justice system.

Crucial to the success of probation is the involvement and support of other agencies, organizations, and interest groups. With this in mind, probation should practice inclusiveness — both formally and informally — when developing policies, initiating programs, crafting supervision strategies, and delivering services. Simply stated, the community needs to have a role in community corrections.

The public wants the truth.

An open and candid dialogue between probation and the tax paying public will foster trusting relationships — relationships that will result in long-term benefits in the furtherance of probation’s mission.

Additional Wants

In addition to these seven objectives, it has been our observation that society, while not necessarily articulating it, desires of probation two other qualities.

The public wants probation to demonstrate good stewardship.

Society should be able to reasonably expect probation officials, who are public servants, to use their resources — both human and financial — rationally and to their fullest. It is imperative that probation officials devote their limited resources to where they can do the most good.

Likewise, in an effort to derive the greatest benefit from these limited resources, probation should develop cooperative relationships with law enforcement and social service agencies for the purpose of enhancing public safety efforts, holding offenders accountable, and reducing victimization.

I will acknowledge that successful partnerships, like successful marriages, do not occur without some difficulties. Successful collaboration requires a commitment to consensus building, occasional compromise, a shared vision, and a lot of hard work. It is far easier to put forth no effort to develop interagency relationships, to continue to hold to time-honored but unvalidated practices, and, paraphrasing Albert Einstein, to continue to do the same old thing yet expect different results. That is not good stewardship.

Considering the limited resources probation, law enforcement, and social service agencies have to work with, the argument can be made that these partnerships are not only good, they are imperative for those agencies engaged in combating crime and the associated problems that plague society.

The public wants ethical and visionary leadership from its probation officials.

Now I suspect that if I had a room full of representatives from my community, and I asked them what they wanted from their probation system, not one of them would say they expected ethical and visionary leadership. Yet all that would be needed is a single event which demonstrated that a probation official committed a transgression, or neglected to anticipate and subsequently plan for an emerging problem, or failed to assume a leadership role in a particularly critical initiative, and the public would be crying for that official's head.

Found in the Book of Proverbs is a passage I find myself calling upon with increased frequency, and that passage is: "Where there is no vision, the people perish." Well, that passage can just as easily be applied to the probation profession. Without visionary leadership, and without a clear, constant, and compelling set of values, probation will never assume its rightful place in the criminal justice system.

Conclusion

In concluding my remarks, I want to make an observation. It is my sense that probation in Poland is still very young — it is still developing. That places you in an enviable position. You have the opportunity be very deliberate in creating your system. Too, you have the luxury to learn from our many mistakes and our few successes.

The late management expert and scholar Peter Drucker developed a simple self assessment tool that organizations might apply to guide them and make them more responsive to their customers' expectations. That instrument solicits responses to five questions:

- What is our mission?
- Who is our customer?
- What does our customer value?
- What are our results?
- What is our plan?

In addition, Dr. Corbett has added a sixth question, which can assist organizations in establishing specific goals, and that question is:

- What do we want people to say about our organization in one, or two, or five years?

These questions, if answered honestly and intelligently, can provide probation a roadmap to meeting and exceeding society's expectations.

Thank you for allowing me to share my views with you today. You have my best wishes in your efforts to craft a model probation system.

**INFORMATION ABOUT
EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE**

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

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

Submissions for publication consideration should be formatted for letter size paper, double-spaced, with at least one inch margins. Persons submitting articles, commentaries, or book reviews should enclose a brief biographical sketch or resume and a photograph for possible inclusion. Submissions

may be sent electronically to drbeto@shsu.edu or dbeto@tca.net or by conventional mail to:

Christie Davidson, Director
National Association of Probation Executives
Correctional Management Institute of Texas
George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center
Sam Houston State University
Huntsville, Texas 77341-2296

Specific questions concerning *Executive Exchange* may be directed to Dan Richard Beto, Editor, at (979) 822-1273, or to Christie Davidson at (936) 294-3757.

Executive Exchange does not accept advertisements.

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

PROBATION AND POLICE PARTNERSHIPS

By

Donald G. Evans

President, Board of Directors
Canadian Training Institute
Toronto, Ontario, Canada

This paper was delivered at the International Probation Conference held in Mielno, Poland, on May 24-26, 2006.

Introduction

Before beginning my presentation I would like to thank the organizers of this conference for the opportunity to share my experiences with probation partnerships and to visit your lovely country! I also wish to commend you for convening a conference on such a critical topic as *Probation Today and Perspectives for the Future Based on Social Expectations*. I trust that my comments on the role probation and police partnerships play in the provision of public safety services will be helpful to you in the furtherance of your objectives in the delivery of probation services.



Donald G. Evans

Why Partnerships?

There are three major reasons why probation/police partnerships have been developed in North America. The first rationale relates to the problem of violent crime, particularly in certain sections of large urban centers. The strain placed on local probation agencies to adequately supervise high-risk violent offenders dictated an examination of new ways of providing supervision to this targeted group of offenders. It was also clear that traditional probation responses, such as reporting to a probation office, were not working. The public expectation that the government provide a "seamless web" of public safety also suggested the need to examine how probation goes about its work. Finally, budgetary concerns also played a significant role in the search for new and more effective means to supervise high-risk and violent offenders. Serious resource issues plagued probation agencies and it seemed logical to attempt to pool resources for the common good, in this instance the joining forces with local police to enhance public safety as it related to the reduction of re-offending by high-risk offenders on community supervision.

For the past decade, in both the United States and Canada, probation agencies have been exploring the possibilities and implementing promising approaches to the supervision of high-risk

offenders in community settings. From team supervision models, intensive supervision strategies, use of advance technological aids, to the development of either formal or informal partnerships with local police agencies probation has sought solutions to the problem of supervising high-risk offenders.

Reinvention of Probation

In the North American context, a major movement in probation has been the effort to reinvent the notion of probation based on evidence of effectiveness. This has led to the development of at least three interesting approaches to the delivery of probation services, and in some cases has led to a combining of approaches in an effort to develop a more robust probation presence.

The first of these approaches I have called *risk-based probation* and it is probably best explained by looking at three elements used in supervision of offenders. This approach relies on the actuarial assessment of risk and is committed to the targeting of high-risk offenders for close supervision. Two other aspects of this approach is that it is pro-active, that is it doesn't rely on the offender reporting but seeks out the offender in his or her community context, and secondly, it is anticipatory in that, based on assessments and intelligence from community contacts, it seeks to intervene before a new offence is committed. This implies a higher rate of technical violations for this supervised group of offenders. This approach has also been labelled the "broken windows model" after the concept that by dealing with the little details that signal crime and disorder in a community public safety can be enhanced. Another way to look at this idea is to see it as a disruption of "routines" that encourage offenders to re-offend. This approach places an emphasis on offender accountability.

As a result of a major emphasis on looking for programs that are effective in the reduction of re-offending, a number of probation agencies have begun to implement what is commonly referred to as the "what works" agenda, based on Canadian research on program interventions. I have called this reinvention effort *rehabilitative probation*, where the emphasis is on assessment of not only static risk factors but on criminogenic needs, that if met would reduce the risk of re-offending. The main programs being used in this context are cognitive behavioural.

The third approach being instituted in some probation agencies I have called *restorative probation*, which has a strong emphasis on services to victims and seeks to involve the community in the management of offenders in the local community. Usually, but not exclusively, this approach seems to be more prevalent in work with young offenders.

I do not wish to spend too much time discussing the last two approaches, but feel compelled to note that as I have stated earlier, a probation agency may attempt all three approaches depending on the needs and distribution of cases under supervision. No one

approach can satisfy the complexities of supervising offenders in community settings, especially if public safety is the ultimate goal. But for my purpose in dealing with probation/police partnerships in the supervision of violent high-risk offenders, it is best located in the risk-based probation approach.

The authors of the monographs on *Broken Windows Probation* have highlighted the following key strategies for a probation that works:

- The importance of placing public safety as the priority of the probation.
- The requirement that offenders be supervised in their community and not the probation office.
- The need to find ways to rationally allocate resources.
- The requirement to provide for consistent enforcement of probation conditions and a quick response to technical violations.
- The need to develop partnerships with other law enforcement or social service agencies in the local community.
- Implement and further develop evidence-based approaches to offender programming.
- Establish performance-based measures for probation, adopt a results oriented culture, and welcome evaluation of probation programs.
- All of this requires leadership, therefore cultivate and develop strong leaders in your probation agency.

A quick review of the factors these authors believe lead to a probation service that is active, effective, and efficient indicates that in the case of violent high-risk offenders being supervised in the community, the most promising approach is the development of partnerships with local police agencies.

Let us now turn to three aspects of developing and maintaining effective partnerships.

Partnerships

The three key characteristics of effective partnerships involve attention to the development of a clear vision of what the partnership can accomplish, how the agency will work towards meeting the objectives of the partnership, and gives thought to what impact is expected of the partnership. Again these three elements are:

- **Vision:** Successful organizations working together create a compelling picture of the possibilities of working in partnership. A number of probation/police agencies have created a vision of the possibilities of what could be done with collaboration and cooperation between their respected agencies. The vision should clearly state what the partners want to accomplish and how partnering their resources will achieve the ends desired.
- **Intimacy:** The work that these agencies are doing could not be accomplished without developing close working relations based on sharing of resources and information and on mutual respect and trust for each others agency. It also involves a solid commitment to specific goals (public safety, supervision of high-risk offenders) and to the partnership itself.
- **Impact:** It should be remembered that partnering is only worthwhile if it achieves outcomes (results) that add real productivity and value to the enterprise of providing community safety. To achieve this impact will require an action

plan of how the partners will accomplish the ends desired. The plan will set out the goals and objectives, responsibilities, resources being committed and rules for the partnership.

I would now like to briefly discuss some elements of successful partnering.

Successful Partnering

The following characteristics are indicative of what needs to be done to ensure successful partnering:

- The partners need to clearly identify the results they desire from the partnering venture.
- Partners who agree to use their resources to make a difference in their community are more likely to be successful.
- Jointly assess the community needs and the needs of the partnership to deliver the agreed upon services will increase the chances for success.
- The importance of clarifying the rules upon which the partnership will operate is a key to success. (More on this later, when we discuss protocols.)
- It will be important to publicly recognize achievements of the partnership.
- Successful partnerships are able to make ongoing corrections in order to facilitate improvements in service delivery.
- A climate or culture that evidences a willingness to take calculated risks is important.
- Another characteristic of successful partnering is the encouragement that is given to creativity and innovation.
- Partnering between agencies can lead to a productive challenging of each other to improve.
- It is important that the results of the partnering program be evaluated and it is also important to evaluate the partnership itself.

Finally, on this point a gentle reminder that successful partnering will require time to plan effectively, to train staff, to practice partnering techniques, to manage obstacles and disagreements, and to manage resistance to new ways of supervising offenders.

Before going on to a discussion of protocols, let me digress a little to give you some examples of probation/police partnerships and the specific targets they sought to impact. The targets were:

- In Canada, they have been used to supervise high-risk parole or statutory released offenders.
- In the United States they have been used for curfew monitoring of high-risk juvenile offenders, parolees, and probationers.
- In the Netherlands they have been used for direct supervision of high-risk offenders.
- In United Kingdom they have been used to supervise prolific offenders and in burglary reduction programs.
- In Canada, United States and the United Kingdom they are also employed in the supervision of sex offenders either on probation or parole.

Returning now to our discussion of successful partnerships let us take a look at the issue of partnership protocols.

Executive Exchange

Partnership Protocol

It is extremely important that, in order to avoid misunderstanding and difficulties in the future, a protocol be entered in by the partners. This guarantees a mechanism that will enhance accountability, clarify roles and responsibilities, as well as provide a means to solve problems and conflicts that may emerge during the life of the partnership. Protocols typically include:

- The duration or length of the partnership is clearly stated.
- The purpose of the partnership is identified.
- The objectives or goals of the partnership are noted.
- A program name or title is agreed upon. (For example, Operation Spotlight.)
- The specific conditions and procedures related to the partnership are listed with attention given to administration and operational guidelines, especially if there is any difference between how the partnership functions and the host agencies. This section will also deal with management/supervision of staff (chain of command issues) and make explicit how the partnership will operate, file reports, enforce conditions, and share equipment and information.
- The training of staff who will be working in the partnership should also be set out in the protocol, who will provide it and how often.
- The mechanism for handling the violation process, and hearings, including arrests, etc., should be seen as a shared responsibility of the partnership. To avoid confusion have the process explicit in the protocol.
- The managing of relations with the media is an important consideration, especially when the partnership is targeting high-risk offenders. Who speaks for the partnership and the involved agencies should be planned and not incident driven.

If thoughtful planning and careful crafting of a protocol is done the agencies involved will find the partnership easier to implement.

I would now like to review for you what I believe have been some of the lessons learned from the implementation of probation/police partnerships in North America.

Lessons Learned

From a review of literature and narratives about probation/police partnerships, I have discerned six possible lessons that can be learned from these efforts and if we can correct for them or better plan to address them probation could improve its delivery of community safety initiatives. The lessons, in no particular order of importance are:

- Given the communities that probation/police partnerships tend to operate (lower socio-economic areas, areas of high crime rates and noticeable disorder) it will be important for probation to learn how to deal with power differences both within and between the communities served. This is essential if probation expects to adequately and appropriately engage the community it wishes to serve.
- In efforts by the partnership to engage the community effectively in assisting in the supervision efforts, it will need to examine the appropriate conditions for genuine responsibility to be exercised.

- Probation needs a better understanding of the role of various levels of government, especially as they impact the local community.
- In efforts of the partnership to develop consensus, its members must keep themselves open and subject to challenge and to the possibility of change.
- The partnerships need to develop the necessary structures and processes that enable full participation of the partners and the community in which the partnership operates.
- The issue of accountability is an important and essential aspect of the partnership and appropriate forms need to be addressed.

Finally, I believe the major lesson to be learned is the need for a constant search for new ways of thinking and doing probation. The theme of this conference indicates that you have joined with the rest of the probation community in such a search.

By way of summary and conclusion let me close by briefly discussing four observations about probation/police partnerships.

Conclusion

In terms of effectiveness and efficiency in the supervision of high-risk offenders, particularly offenders prone to violence or to sexual offending, the partnering of probation and police is a key element in the provision of public security services.

It is clear, I believe, that probation and police organizations working together create a compelling picture of the possibilities for enhanced security services.

The work that probation/police agencies are doing that I know about could not be accomplished without developing close working relationships based on sharing of information and mutual trust and respect for each others abilities.

Finally, I would note that partnering is only worthwhile if it achieves outcomes that add real productivity and value to each organization and to the communities they serve.

Again, thank you for allowing me the privilege to share and report on my observations about partnering as it relates to the critical work of probation and police in ensuring community safety. My wish is that you will continue your efforts to develop a model probation system within your specific context. Thank you for your kind attention.

OFFENDER REENTRY PROGRAMS PROVIDE SOLUTIONS FOR A SAFER COMMUNITY

by

Gerald R. Hinzman
 Director
 Sixth Judicial District Department
 of Correctional Services
 Cedar Rapids, Iowa

These remarks were delivered at the International Probation Conference held in Mielno, Poland, on May 24-26, 2006.

The Reentry Challenge

When thinking about offenders doing time in prison, we must also be thinking about returning them back to the community in such a way that they are less likely to commit new crimes and, more importantly, so they do not create new victims. Therefore we must plan for their release mindful of good cognitive programming, evidenced based practices, and effective accountability.

Rather than letting someone merely walk out the door of the prison, we need to develop a good transition model. Proper assessments and appropriate treatment must be matched with the proper level of supervision. As stated previously during this conference, the public expects us to provide effective treatment for a safe release.

This will most often include some role in assisting with reunification with the family, appropriate living arrangements, and employment. In each of those instances, this activity should be designed to connect the returning offender with pro-social support groups.

As an example, if you allow a returning offender to seek any employment without thoughtful consideration, they may go back to hanging around with the same people they always got into trouble with.



Gerald R Hinzman

Designing a Good Reentry Program

What would an example of a good Reentry Program look like? First there should be recognition of the special population to be addressed with the program. It could be sex offenders, offenders with mental health issues, or hard core criminals who do not want to change. It could be less serious offenders.

Next those within the selected group should be screened for appropriateness using effective assessment tools to determine if they can succeed. There must be good cooperation between

prison counselors and the community reentry team to ensure a smooth transition from prison to the community.

Program Components: Once selected into the reentry program the offender should be involved in a program with components similar to the following:

- A reentry meeting to welcome the offender back and provide an overview of the resources available to them (Welcome And Resource Notification, sometimes called "Lever Pulling").
- Strict offender accountability is enforced to go hand and hand with effective treatment.
- A citizens advisory board helps the transition
- An administrative judge enforces conditions and ensures compliance with treatment.
- The success of the program hinges upon a good array of proven treatment and sanction options.

WARN Meetings for Reentry: Welcome And Resource Notification (WARN) meetings permit the offender to meet members of the community who will be working with them as they reenter the community. The meetings inform them of the resources and programs available and establish the accountability that will be required.

- The program can be designed for the most prolific offenders, mental health reentry, sex offenders, or other specified offenders.
- There is participation by faith community, prosecutors, law enforcement, victims, neighborhoods, treatment providers, and reentry staff.
- Employment services and housing are critical.

High Risk Unit for Effective Accountability: The High Risk Unit is an effectively trained group of officers who will enforce the conditions of the reentry program and ensure accountability. This group of officers works hand and hand with the treatment staff.

- Sworn and certified peace officers.
- Full arrest powers.
- Expanded search authority in probation and parole agreements.
- Arrest for gun and drug cases and refer for prosecution.

Making Reentry Work

Building on the work of the Reinventing Probation Council of the Manhattan Institute, which produced the seminal monograph

Executive Exchange

“Transforming Probation through Leadership: The “Broken Windows” Model, a credible reentry program should embrace seven key strategies.

Strategy 1 – Public Safety Must Come First: The primary concern of the public is to be free of crime. If where they live, work, or visit is not free of crime, the public will not feel safe. Even if the overall crime rate is low, it will not matter to those who live with crime on a daily basis.

Public safety itself must be redefined to include fewer victims. To say our goals are to produce outcomes that reduce crime and reduce recidivism places our focus too narrowly. By adopting short-sighted outcomes we only have to get the offender through our program and a short period beyond (depending on how recidivism is defined). To adopt an outcome of having fewer victims in the community we must think through a longer term approach. In doing so, we will also reduce crime and reduce recidivism as well.

Strategy 2 – Supervise Offenders in the Neighborhood, Not the Office: A primary goal of neighborhood based supervision is to increase public safety in the neighborhood by increasing social and economic capital there. For example, if a reentry program operates out of a community center, its presence helps stabilize the neighborhood. With stabilization, other social agencies can also co-locate and deliver services. This in turn creates an aura of security in the neighborhood and attracts economic development and community revitalization.

- Rethink the “fortress” mentality and move operations to the field; create safe havens or resource centers.
- Effective supervision is community-centered supervision.
- The office is the “base” of supervision, while the community should be the “place” of supervision.
- Officers must draw on informal sources of neighborhood and community social control.

Strategy 3 – Rationally Allocate Scarce Resources: Use good assessment tools to make decisions. Failure to make good placement decisions will result in putting offenders in programs that do not match, thereby wasting valuable and scarce resources that could be more effectively utilized:

- Information-driven decision making is critical. Use a good data base to make decisions about options for treatment and supervision.
- Accurate knowledge about offenders is vital. Use good assessments.

Make certain that the program is located where the need is. Do not just place a program out in the field for the sake of doing so:

- Resources and staff are allocated to places where risks to public safety are the greatest.
- Requires focus where community and victim vulnerabilities are the greatest.
- Threats offenders pose to public safety are local in nature.

Strategy 4 – Provide for Strong Enforcement of Reentry Conditions and a Quick Response to Violations: Make certain there is good program validity. Treatment is achieved through good

accountability. There must be an effective response to violating behaviors.

- Need for aggressive surveillance and control for offenders deemed a threat to public safety.
- Provision of swift, timely, and proportionate responses to all violations of conditions.
- Graduated sanctions provide a continuum of responses short of revocation.
- Demanding enforcement of offender accountability for compliance with conditions equates to sound practice.

Strategy 5 – Develop Partners in the Community: It is important to develop community partners who can effectively help with the reentry process. Examples of good partners are people who will be able to interact with the ex-offender once he is released from supervision but still needs the guidance and help of people in the community. Mentoring, mental health, and employment are some examples.

- Partnerships and collaboration beyond traditional boundaries recognizes community expertise.
- Augments the limited operational capacity of reentry programs to effect offender change.
- Recognizes that limited leverage of probation can be enhanced by drawing on “social capital” furnished by communities.
- Many partners: law enforcement, human services, mental health, faith-based, local citizen groups, victims’ groups, and neighborhood associations.

Strategy 6 – Establish Performance-Based Initiatives: These initiatives can be developed from the outcomes that have been established. Often broad-based outcomes like reducing recidivism, fewer victims, etc., are difficult to measure in the short run. Intermediate outcomes can be helpful measures in such cases. For example, measuring how many offenders are employed in pro-social work environments is an intermediate outcome. How many offenders are involved in treatment and the rate of successful program completion can be intermediate outcomes.

- Commitment here requires effective programming, evidence-based practices, and strong program design/implementation.
- Public safety means more than recidivism reduction, while achieving this outcome is important, one must think fewer victims.
- Programming must draw on “what works” and principles that drive effective correctional programming.
- Risk classification, criminogenic needs and responsivity are critical.
- Programmatic interventions must connect offenders to environments that have pro-social supports and structure.
- Rehabilitative programming grounded in evidence-based practices is one component of reentry programming.

Strategy 7 – Exercise Strong Leadership: We must recognize the difference between leadership and management. Leadership conceptualizes new ideas and direction. Leadership sets course or direction for the agency and determines what is not negotiable. Leadership is at the table developing and renewing vision and

trends at the national level. Leadership develops a strong, committed management team.

Management questions and explores new concepts, particularly for their department. Management contributes to developing new programs and sets direction. Management develops the action plan and the implementation plan for programs. Management sets outcome measures and uses data to ensure program fidelity. Management buys into the course of action set by leaders. Therefore:

- Leadership is, in the final analysis, the most important element of the strategy. Leaders must be willing to be “risk-takers” in re-designing their agencies.
- Must provide a framework to meet the needs of staff and increase their level of understanding.
- Must seek tangible outcomes that matter to the community.
- Must “embrace accountability” for producing results that contribute to public safety.
- Leaders and practitioners must consider how their vision and actions create public value.

Listening to My Mother’s Advise

My Mother had eight children. We would always ask her which of us she loved the most. She always said she loved the child who needed her most at the time. We should apply our scarce resources the same way. When folks are ready to change, it makes sense that we should be prepared to show them the way to change. We should have the resources in place to do so.

Ex-offenders have basic needs that must be met for them to exist:

- A place where they can live with their family.
- A job to sustain them.
- Access to treatment and learning.
- Restoration of basic rights.

Offenders usually come from families where there exists patterns of criminality. They do not believe they have a chance to succeed and generally do not believe that anyone really cares if they do succeed. As young adults they have a chip on their shoulder and are angry. If asked why they are angry they probably could not tell you why. It is an attitude passed down from one generation to the next. It is something called generational rage. This is why effective programming, mentoring, and pro-social support systems are so important to the reentry process.

Conclusion

At the end of the day it is all about having fewer victims. We cannot build our way out of a prison crisis and it does not make sense to try to. Let’s lock up those we are afraid of, but return them mindful of public safety and fewer victims. Give our citizens what they asked for. Do not muddy the water with bad public policy. Use evidenced-based principles and programs for best results and reducing victimization. It is in our hands to make a better future.

DEVELOPMENTS IN PROBATION IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

by

David Thomas
Assistant Chief Officer
South Yorkshire Probation Area
Sheffield, United Kingdom

These remarks were presented at the International Probation Conference held in Mielno, Poland, on May 24-26, 2006.

My theme for today is, once again, pain and change in the Probation Service in the United Kingdom (UK).

Last year I talked of a number of events that involved change, starting in 2001 when the Probation Service moved from being 54 semi-autonomous Probation Services to being one National Service with 42 Areas and one National Directorate exercising a large amount of control over all the Areas, including monitoring performance in a way that had never been done before. Fortunately, South Yorkshire was not one of the Areas affected by amalgamation, which by all accounts was very painful.

In 2003 a new Criminal Justice Act was passed which changed the entire sentencing framework for the Probation sentence, but only for offences committed after the beginning of April 2005. So for the last year we have been dealing with two sentencing frameworks, with one gradually fading as the other grows.

With the new sentences it was necessary to have new national standards for working with offenders. We have had national standards for ten years, but these were complicated in the area of contact with offenders. Because they are complicated, they are not well understood by probation officers and therefore not followed very well.

The final part of the new Act is due to be implemented in November this year. This new sentence will bring on an additional 50,000 people a year under the supervision of the Probation Service. In South Yorkshire this will be 1,500 and at any one time this will be the work of between ten and fifteen probation officers, but with no extra resources to employ them.

The next event was the publication, in the autumn of 2004, of a very influential report on the management of offenders. The Prison Service and Probation Service have always been separate. This report recommended that they were joined under one management system, called the National Offender Management Service (NOMS). There would be one National Offender Manager (NOM), with ten Regional Offender Managers (ROM) who would control the Offender Managers (OM). The ROMs would contract with the prisons to provide beds and programmes and with an Interventions Directorate to provide similar things in the community — programmes, community service, drug treatment, etc. The interventions would also be put out for competition; not privatisation they say because if probation offered the best value for money we would keep the work.

These plans need legislation to be put in place properly, particularly putting services out for competition. The legislation has been greatly delayed and has not yet come before parliament. This has not stopped the structures being put in place, with the NOM and ROMs there for almost a year now and there being over 1,300 people employed by the new organisation — which has yet to supervise a single offender!

One of the reasons for the delay in legislation is the massive opposition to the plans. A national consultation on the plans got 748 responses, only 8 of which were fully supportive. The opposition came from all sectors — judges, politicians, unions, staff organisations, and the like. Did this change anything? Only, it seems that the Offender Managers will remain in the Probation Services rather than be directly controlled by the ROMs and the interventions will be a slightly separate part of the Probation Service.

Now, forgive me if I seem to go off at a tangent. I know, and you all know, that it is impossible to totally eliminate risk from the people we supervise. The best we can do is to try and manage it to the lowest level possible, but some offenders will re-offend, sometimes seriously and with terrible consequences. Ultimately though, it is often quite unpredictable and we know that 80% of serious new offences are committed by people assessed as low or medium risk. Every year there are a number of very serious offences, murders and rapes, committed by people under supervision. Normally this gets a little media attention nationally. In 2004 and 2005 there were the normal events and the normal attention. However, and you can say I am very cynical, but in the last three months these events have been the subject of a series of major national headlines, being used by the government to say that the Probation Service is failing and in need of major reform and that the way to do it is by way of NOMS! Coincidence?

It has, of course, left the Probation Service very battered, bruised, demoralised, and angry for we feel that we have been turned upon by our political masters. This all adds to the sense of unsettlement and uncertainty and a loss of confidence. For while the changes to the way we work are fundamentally sound, the transition is difficult.

Some years ago Probation Services split into functional specialist — Community Supervision, Through-care (during and after custody), Community Service, etc. Now we are changing to end-to-end offender management — a phrase you may remember from last year. This means that an offender will be managed by one offender manager (probation officer) for the whole time that they are in contact with the Probation Service and sentence after sentence, until they stop offenders or die, or the OM retires. Very sensible, very sound. The Offender Manager would assess the needs and co-ordinate the interventions, but do relatively little of the work themselves. Fortunately, we still only deal with adults, for very different skills and methods are required for working with young people and the two are difficult to mix. It is also an accepted principle that different OMs will manage different people in the same family for we recognise that if one Offender Manager has everyone in a family there will be conflicts of interest, for how can a child tell the person who is also working with their father that they are being abused or a wife that they are being beaten? How can the Offender Manager help them and still retain the trust of the man and be able to work effectively with him?

But end-to-end offender management is right, as well as putting the greater resources with those who pose the greater risk, better to control those risks. Hence, an Offender Manager will be given two, three or four times as much time to work with high risk people than low risk ones, obviously based on very good, highly structured assessment, based on a national assessment tool called OASys. The introduction of OASys has been uncomfortable for many long-serving probation officers, who prefer to trust their own judgement. But it is not judgement that is being replaced, but a consistent structure applied. OASys is now used nationally, with the next battle being to improve the quality.

Of course for many people who have specialised for years, end-to-end offender management brings many new challenges and much re-learning, indeed for staff who have joined in the last few years much new learning about sentences, different offence types, and risk. All this is right, but very unsettling.

Next year we will introduce a new computer case management information system that will join the Probation and Prison Serv-

ices. Bought from a Canadian company — thank you Canada — it will hold huge amounts of information about every offender and improve our ability to manage them and their risk immeasurably. But of course it will be a source of change and uncertainty and resistance from many people who do not have confidence with computers, even though we have had computers for ten years or more for all staff.

So where does this leave us? There is a revolution going on in Probation in the UK and it will continue no matter what. Or maybe it is evolution, for I can see no end to the changes. Hopefully, some of the worse aspects will wither, die, and become extinct. But I am convinced that all the changes, once they can be fully embedded, will serve to enable us to help offenders better, to manage the risks they pose better, to reduce their re-offending, and thus achieve our ultimate aim of protecting the public better and doing a greater service.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES

Membership Application (TAX # 58-1497263)

NAME _____ TITLE _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE # _____ FAX # _____ E-MAIL _____

DATE OF APPLICATION _____

- | | | | | |
|--------------|----------------|--|---|--|
| <i>CHECK</i> | Regular | <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 50 / 1 year | <input type="checkbox"/> \$95 / 2 years | <input type="checkbox"/> \$140 / 3 years |
| | Organizational | <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 250 / 1 year | | |
| | Corporate | <input type="checkbox"/> \$ 500 / 1 year | | |

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

NAPE Secretariat
 ATTN: Christie Davidson
 Correctional Management Institute of Texas
 George J. Beto Criminal Justice Center
 Sam Houston State University
 Huntsville, Texas 77341-2296
 (936) 294-3757

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROBATION SERVICE IN POLAND

by

Magdalena Niewiadomska, Ph. D.
Main Specialist, Probation Section
Department of Enforcement of Judgments and Probation
Ministry of Justice
Warsaw, Poland

This paper was presented at the CEP Probation Conference held in Budapest, Hungary, on March 1-3, 2006.

Introduction

The topic “the development of the probation service in Poland” is very broad and my remarks could be fairly lengthy if I attempted to cover its entire history. Following consultation with conference organizers, I have decided to devote most of my remarks to discussing the changes in the probation service that occurred as a result of the political transformation in Poland.

It could be said that at the time the Republic of Poland underwent its political transformation, the probation service was “reformed” as well, but it happened several years later. The most important dates for Polish policy transformation are the years 1989-1990, during which we witnessed the collapse of the communist regime, and for the probation service the important year is 2001. Having said this, however, attention will also be directed to the year 1992, when actions by the Polish Government had a profound influence on the current state of the probation service.



Magdalena Niewiadomska

Prior to 1992, probation services were provided generally by volunteer “community probation officers” who performed welfare work. As a result of government action, the probation model was changed to rely on professional probation officers. With this decision, the government allocated funds for 500 new professional probation officers. These new funds were distributed to courts that decided to change to the new model of the probation service. As a result, there was a significant increase in the number of professional probation officers.

This decision was also the beginning of efforts to draft a new act of Parliament to change the position of probation officer and the status of that profession. The change in statute was also influenced by Poland’s desire to become part of the European Union.

In 1997 new regulations in criminal law were instituted with the adoption of a new penal code, new code of proceeding in criminal cases, and the new code of execution of penalties and other measures. These new regulations were the expression of

the new vision of punishment and execution of penalties, and a focus on non-confinement measures and the institutionalization of probation. These changes were also needed due to the process of adjusting Polish law to conform to the standards required by the European Union.

A result of these new criminal regulations was the new role of probation, not only in terms of duties and organizational structure, but also in the area of enhanced professionalism. In 2001 the Parliament passed a new statute, which we refer to as the “probation officer’s act.”

For the sake of clarity, I would like to divide the development of the Polish probation service into two periods: prior to January 1, 2002, and after that date.

The Early Years

The Polish probation service had its beginnings in 1919, when the first probation officers for juvenile offenders were created. They were people from the community who were “trustworthy” who were willing to work with the juvenile courts.

The first professional probation officers for juvenile offenders were hired in 1929; however, in 1935 the Ministry of Justice changed the position of probation officers from professional to a community function. That is why until 1959 the probation service was not professional but voluntary in nature, with an emphasis on welfare work. The primary duties of probation officers were to carry out decisions made during the investigation of the offense and to supervise juveniles on probation.

The quality of the juvenile probation service suffered under the community probation officer system that focused on welfare work. Most of the volunteer probation officers had jobs and, as a result, they conducted their probation officer duties after hours as an additional activity. Because this scheme did not produce the desired results, professional probation officers were again employed in 1959.

Probation services for adult offenders commenced in 1965. It was in that year the Ministry of Justice required probation officers to supervise adult offenders who were sentenced to deprivation of liberty which was conditionally suspended and also offenders who were conditionally released from prison before the end of their sentences.

The next step in the development of the probation service came in 1970, with the passage of a new penal code and code of execution of penalties. These acts brought changes in the system of treating offenders and provided for additional alternatives to incarceration.

In the voievodian (refers to geographic area, similar to a county or district) courts new divisions were created — penitentiary divisions. In these divisions there were judges who served as

inspectors and there were also probation officers. The primary purpose of creating these divisions was to supervise the execution of deprivation of liberty sentences; in addition, these divisions supervised non-custodial sanctions, such as community service and probation. In addition to professional probation officers who were employed and paid by the courts, there was still a need to use community probation officers, who were significantly greater in number than the professionals.

As part of the development of the probation service, coupled with changes in legislation between 1970 and 1986, a formalized structure was created. The Ministry of Justice provided administrative supervision of probation. Both the voievodian and regional courts had professional probation officers and community probation officers that served both adult and juvenile offenders. In the voievodian courts they were in the penitentiary divisions (probation officers for adults) and in the regional courts they were in the criminal divisions (probation officers for adults) and family divisions (probation officers for juveniles) of the courts. Voievodian probation officers coordinated probation officials in the voievodian courts and supervised probation officers in the regional courts in their area.

At the beginning of 1965 there were 19 professional probation officers in the voievodian courts; by year end that number had increased to 30. There was a significant increase in the number of professional probation officers over the next few years, and by 1974 there were 441 in all the courts in Poland. In addition, in 1974 there were approximately 12,000 community probation officers.

Professional probation officers were employees of the courts. They were hired, supervised, and dismissed by the president (chief judge) of the voievodian court.

In the beginning, the qualifications for probation officers were not particularly demanding. Community probation officers for adults could be a person who was a citizen of Poland, had no restricted public rights, had a place to live in Poland, had no prior record, was at least 26 years of age, was trustworthy, and gave no indication that he could not do the job well. Similar requirements were for community probation officers for juveniles; persons in this position could not have had parental responsibility deprived or restricted. Professional probation officers did not have to have a university education.

In the middle 1980s the educational demands for probation officers increased. One of the main conditions was to have a university education, with a major in pedagogics, psychology, or sociology. In addition, a year of training and an examination was required.

Despite these changes, the position of probation officer was not adjusted as to duties, responsibilities, and qualifications and in many courts they were treated as clerks. This changed with the passage of the probation officer act of 2001.

The primary duties of probation officers for adult offenders were: supervision of offenders for a period of five years following release from prison; supervision of offenders conditionally released prior to the end of the sentence; supervision of offenders sentenced to deprivation of liberty, conditionally suspended; and supervision of offenders required to perform community service. Initially the supervision of offenders leaving prison was provided by probation officers working for the courts of the voievodship. In the 1980s those duties were transferred to the probation officers employed by the regional courts. Most of the cases were supervised by community probation officers,

who were supervised by the professional probation officers. The professional probation officers managed those cases that were particularly difficult.

The basic duties of probation officers for juvenile offenders were to carry out the decisions of the court and to supervise juvenile offenders. In addition, they were called upon to carry out judgments made in family cases, such as: supervise parents who had their parental responsibilities restricted or deprived and to assist them exercise their rights and duties; monitor children who are in custody; and execute decisions of the court.

The New Probation

As I mentioned earlier, the most important changes in the probation service came in 2001 when Parliament passed the probation officer's act.

Under this new act, in all the courts there is a probation service which has its own self-government. As a central organ, there is a National Probation Officer's Council (NPOC), which represents professional probation officers. On the level of the district courts, there exists the Meetings of Probation Officers from the District; they are responsible for electing delegates to the NPOC.

At present, the professional probation officers are supported by community probation officers, who do welfare work.

As a result of the new act, probation has taken on a new professionalism. In terms of administration and oversight, the Ministry of Justice supervises the probation service. At the district court level, the district probation officer and the vice district probation officer supervise the probation officers in the district on behalf of the president of the district court. There are 45 district probation officers, each of whom has been appointed by the president of the district court for a term of six years.

On the regional court level, professional and community probation officers supervise both adult and juvenile offenders; these officers work in teams which are separated from the divisions of the courts (criminal and family). They spend most of their time away from the court. At present there are 481 probation officer teams. There are three types of teams: one for the execution of judgments involving adult offenders; one for carrying out judgments involving juvenile and family cases; and a joint team in small courts, where probation officers execute judgments involving both adult and juvenile offenders.

Thanks to the new act, the professional probation officer is the appointed official of the court, which means a stable position. He or she may be dismissed only in some special situation, such as two negative evaluations of the work performed or as the result of disciplinary measures. The act guarantees probation officers very good salaries, allowances for working in the field, and reimbursement for additional duties performed. The officers' work schedules are not regulated, depending upon the amount of work required. They are provided holidays and up to six months of sick leave for a documented illness.

The probation officer's act requires high qualifications for professional probation officers, including spotless character, good health, a university education in pedagogics, psychology, sociology, or law, and a year of training followed by the successful completion of an examination. Probation officers are now viewed as the executive organ of the court.

Probation officers who violate their duties may be subjected to disciplinary measures. There are two levels of disciplinary courts, one is comprised of probation officers elected to serve

Executive Exchange

in this capacity, and the other is in the Ministry of Justice and consists of 12 members.

The primary function of the probation service is to supervise offenders in the community. In our view, supervision not only means control, but also guardianship and education. To achieve these objectives, the probation officer must cooperate with community organizations and institutions that deal with social problems, such as social support centers, employment offices, family centers, police, and municipal government agencies. Our probation service also recognizes the importance of non-governmental organizations in the delivery of needed services. Like probation officers in other countries, Polish probation officers deal with a variety of problems, including addiction to alcohol and drugs, family violence, and pornography of children and teenagers.

Conclusion

The history of the development of the probation service in Poland indicates the most important thing for the service is to specify the standards for probation officers and the duties they perform. This is necessary to guarantee the efficient, effective, and professional realization of the courts' judgments. The standards established in Poland have resulted in:

- a model probation service with professional probation officers;
- education requirements, training, and examination that assures highly qualified probation officers;
- a salary schedule that attracts well-educated and highly motivated people; and
- a process of self-government to represent probation officers.

While the standards we have established are relatively broad in nature, we believe they provide a foundation for other countries in advancing their probation systems. We realize the difficulty in identifying and creating the "ideal model" of a probation system, but drawing from the experiences of other countries, we can learn and implement those programs and practices that work.

At the end of this presentation, it is important to find out in what way Polish probation officers can help their colleagues from other countries, and what we can learn from one another. We can learn by exchanging information and experiences, and through mutual cooperation.

I hope we will derive benefit by attending the workshops at this conference and through personal interaction.

FROM THE BOOKSHELF

The reviews found in this issue of *Executive Exchange* are provided by Donald G. Evans, President of the Canadian Training Institute in Toronto, Ontario, and Dan Richard Beto, Chair of the Governing Board of the Texas Regional Center for Policing Innovation in Huntsville, Texas.

Canadian Youth Justice System

Review of *Responding to Youth Crime in Canada*, by Anthony Doob and Carla Cesaroni, University of Toronto Press, 2004, 290 pp, \$30.95 (paperback).

Most justice systems in the world tend to consider that children and adolescents are different from adults and that they should not be held accountable for violations of the criminal law in the same way as adult criminals. However, there are very substantial differences in how various countries operationalize this general principle. In fact, even in the legal definition of the basic concepts of "child," "youth," and "adult" may differ from jurisdiction to jurisdiction. In the Canadian context "youth" are defined as "neither child nor adult" and criminal responsibility pertains to the ages of 12-17. Those under age 12 are subject to provisions of welfare type legislation and those who commit offences after age 17 are treated as adults. As usual, however, there have been much debate, dialogue, and discussion about these age ranges and provisions have been made to waive youth court in favor of adult court for certain offense categories.

The debate on how to respond to youth crime continues to be hotly debated in Canada, especially with the rise in youth gangs and gun violence and now with the additional "terrorist allegations" in which five of the "Toronto 17" charged with terrorist activity are young offenders, it is timely to consider this book appraising Canada's response to youth crime. Anthony N. Doob and Carla Cesaroni from the Centre of Criminology at the University of Toronto have produced a very thoughtful analysis of youthful offending and the state's subsequent response to the offenders.

In *Responding to Youth Crime in Canada*, published in 2004 by the University of Toronto Press, Doob and Cesaroni have covered in eleven clearly written chapters the background to a separate youth justice system, trends and patterns of youthful offending, and challenge the tendency of government to adopt quick fix approaches to the youth crime problem. Policy and decision makers are in need of clear headed and thoughtful review of what is known and not known about youth crime, and this book fulfills that need. The authors of this book attempt a broad based analysis of the response to youth crime in Canada that should go a long way to assisting Canadians and other interested parties in understanding what can and cannot be achieved by legislative means.

In the opening chapter the authors deal with the relationship between youth crime in the community and the youth justice system and how it responds to apprehended young offenders. In response to the public view that the Young Offenders Act (the legislation prior to the new Youth Criminal Justice Act) was to blame for the increase in youth crime, they argue that the level of youth crime is not determined by the type or form of the youth justice system. The chapter examines youth offending and explanations of offending, including a look at the public's view of the youth justice system. The authors also present an overview of the different approaches to youth justice, from welfare to

criminal justice models that have been developed in Canada in the past 100 years. Chapter two provides an answer to the question concerning the need for a separate justice system. The next chapter follows closely on the arguments found in chapter two and discusses the issue of youth justice and very young children. An analysis of the age of responsibility boundary is presented and the conclusion drawn that the major issue in responding to youth or children's offending "appears to be what is done and what services are available." In other words, according to the authors, "it may be less important whether the law enabling intervention is criminal law created in Ottawa or child welfare law created in each province."

Doob and Cesaroni devote a chapter to a discussion of the nature of youth crime and conclude that there is no fool proof measure of youth crime. The majority of youth offending, when self reported, tends to be minor in nature. Official police and court statistics measure the results of discretionary action on the part of youth criminal justice agents. When looking at victimization reports, it seems that youth tend to victimize those that are close to them in age. Chapter six elaborates on this discussion by examining trends in youth offending, and the authors conclude that generally crime and youth crime specifically are not on the increase. But the authors caution us not to be complacent and maintain that there is a need to press for improvements in the youth justice system and in responses to youth crime. Doob and Cesaroni devote a chapter to the special issues related to youth gangs, school violence, and the problem of recidivists. They suggest that this is a very complex area and that we need to know what we are talking about before we draw conclusions on what is to be done.

Having dealt with issues about youth crime, the authors turn their attention to an examination of the youth justice system. Chapters seven through ten look at the various elements of the system. There is discussion on how the case gets to court, the issue of transfer of youth to adult courts, the sentencing options available, and the impact of custody on youth. These chapters are very readable and give an excellent overview of the youth justice system in Canada.

This book concerns itself with the problem of youth crime and how to effectively respond. The concluding chapter takes a look at what the authors call quick fixes that the state has introduced to respond to youth crime. They select three examples for discussion: the development of harsher sentences, boot camps, and the use of curfews. The research that is cited indicates that these three examples are ineffective in dealing with youth crime. The authors note that "the major hurdle of the quick fix approaches to youthful offending is that these methods appear to be developed completely independently of what is known about youthful offending."

Returning to the major themes of the book, youth crime and the youth justice system, the authors remind us that we need to differentiate three phenomena: youth crime as it exists in our community, the youth justice system and how it responds to those youth who are arrested, and the causes of youth crime.

Executive Exchange

The first two phenomena were the subject of this book and were thoroughly and scholarly dealt with. The third was only mentioned in passing but in the hints given by the authors in their discussion of the need to focus on long-term prevention and in the denoting of the characteristics of effective intervention programs indicates that they understand and take seriously the need to consider more fully the causes of youth crime. However, the response to the causes may not be totally within the ambit of the youth criminal justice system.

Given that at the time of the study, the Youth Criminal Justice Act has had its one year anniversary, this book provides an essential aid to anyone interested in reflecting on how the government responds to youth crime. This book will be the means for informing the debate on what is to be done about youth crime in Canada and perhaps provide other jurisdictions with another way of seeing their own responses to youthful offending. This is an important work and is a most welcomed addition to the library of those working with youthful offenders and to anyone interested in justice for our youth.

Donald G. Evans

Leadership in the Organization

Review of "Second in Command," the May 2006 issue of *Harvard Business Review*.

In past issues of *Executive Exchange* we occasionally review articles appearing in periodicals peculiar to areas of interest to chief executives in community corrections. Such is the case in the May 2006 issue of *Harvard Business Review*, which contains articles dealing with the "second in command" of organizations.

In "Second in Command: The Misunderstood Role of the Chief Operation Officer," Nathan Bennett and Stephen A. Miles provide a thought provoking look at organization hierarchy and the importance of a highly functional and empowered second in command. Bennett is professor of management in the Business School at Georgia Tech University in Atlanta and Miles is a partner in the leadership consulting firm of Heidrick and Struggles, also in Atlanta. The two are coauthors of *Riding Shotgun: The Role of the COO* published by Stanford University Press in 2006. The *Harvard Business Review* article is adapted from their book.

Read from a community corrections professional's perspective, the term Chief Executive Officer (CEO) may be viewed as Chief Probation Officer and Chief Operating Officer (COO) may be equated to the position of Deputy Chief Probation Officer.

The authors make an interesting point early in the article: when examining "COOs as a class, one thing immediately becomes clear: there are almost no constants. People with very different backgrounds ascend to the role and succeed in it." They also point out that it is "difficult to pinpoint the kind of environments in which COOs thrive" and there is "no single agreed-upon description of what the job entails or even what it is called." According to the authors, because the COO role is defined primarily by its relationship with the CEO, and with no two CEOs being alike, the COO may assume many roles. From their view, there are seven kinds of COOs:

- The *Executor*, who leads "the execution of strategies developed by the top management team."

- The *Change Agent* is charged with leading "a special strategic imperative, such as a turnaround, a major organizational change, or a planned rapid expansion. While the mandate is not as broad as the general execution of strategy, the magnitude of the challenge demands that the change agent COO have a degree of unquestioned authority similar to that of an executor COO."
- The *Mentor* is frequently brought into the organization to serve as a guide to a "young or inexperienced CEO."
- The *Other Half* COO is not a mentor but a foil "to complement the CEO's experience, style, knowledge base, or penchants."
- The *Partner* is brought into an organization where "the CEO is the kind of person who works best with a partner." This management model has been referred to as "two in a box" or termed "co-leadership."
- The *Heir Apparent* frequently is named COO to be groomed or tested as the CEO-elect.
- The *Most Valuable Player (MVP)* is someone in the organization that is "considered too valuable to lose, particularly to a competitor," and is offered the job of COO.

In each of the seven types of COOs identified, the authors provide examples from recent events in corporate America.

Bennett and Miles also provide a discussion of what the CEO and COO owe to one another. The COO owes to the CEO true respect, an ego in check, an eye for execution, and substantial coaching and coordination skills. Conversely, the CEO owes to the COO open and unfettered communication, clear decision rights, a "lock on the back door," and a "shared spotlight."

This is an interesting article that offers suggestions or organizational structure and duties. If the article is any indication of the quality of *Riding Shotgun: The Role of the COO*, the book ought to be in high demand by persons charged with leading organizations.

The second article of interest in this issue of *Harvard Business Review* is "The Five Messages Leaders Must Manage," written by John Hamm, a general partner at VSP Capital in San Francisco. According to the author, all too frequently "leaders fail to explain what they mean when they talk about":

- organizational structure;
- financial results;
- their own jobs;
- time management; and
- corporate culture.

"Left unclear," Hamm believes "these concepts can throw a firm (or organization) into turmoil — but when given proper focus, they confer extraordinary leverage."

In managing these five messages, the author suggests the leader should consider taking on a new mind-set and looking at issues and solution differently from the conventional mental model. For example, when conveying to staff the organizational structure and hierarchy, the executive should focus more on optimizing human resources than making the organizational chart a proxy for politics. When addressing financial results, the executive should conduct a diagnostic examination to determine the root cause of any shortfalls rather than immediately penalizing misses and blaming someone.

As for the leader's sense of his or her job, instead of assuming that he or she is the source of all answers, everyone on staff

should be considered for answers and that more questions should be asked. The conventional model of time management takes the position that time is scarce so staff should scramble against constraints; under the new model, time is viewed as fixed, so choices should be made wisely within constraints. And as to conveying the corporate culture, executives tend to hand this responsibility to the human resource office, rather than creating an environment in which everyone can help the organization become successful.

Hamm, in concluding his article, writes: "In the end, the power of clear communication is really a game of leverage. A CEO who communicates precisely to ten direct reports, each of whom communicates with equal precision to 40 other talented employees, effectively aligns the organization's commitment and energy around a clear, well-understood, shared vision of the company's real goals, priorities, and opportunities. He or she will save the company time, money, and resources and allow extraordinary things to happen."

A final article found in this issue worthy of mention is "Change Management in Government" by Frank Ostroff, managing partner of Ostroff and Associates. According to the author, "leaders of government agencies operate under handicaps largely unknown within the private sector, but the best of them have improved performance by adopting and adapting some goals and methods that have been proven in business."

In this article Ostroff provides five "principles" government officials should employ when trying to lead an organization; they are:

- "improve performance against agency mission," focusing on effective and efficient execution and avoiding mission drift;
- "win over stakeholders," both external and internal;
- "create a road map" that identifies performance objectives, sets priorities, and one that clearly rolls out a change program;
- "take a comprehensive approach," rather than attempting to bring about change piecemeal; and
- "be a leader, not a bureaucrat," which is the greatest challenge in transforming an organization.

According to the author, change programs that embrace these principles are more likely to survive when there is a change in the organization's leadership.

Harvard Business Review is an excellent source for timely articles that are relevant to organizational management and leadership. Probation executives desiring to enhance their skills would do well to read this publication with regularity.

Dan Richard Beto

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

PAROLE PARTNERSHIP FORGED WITH MARSHALS SERVICE

In an article appearing in the *Sacramento Bee*, Staff Writer **Edgar Sanchez** reports that on May 17, 2006, approximately 60 parole agents with the California Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation were sworn in as Deputy U.S. Marshals in Sacramento. Their mission is to work with the U.S. Marshals Service to seek out and apprehend California's parole violators and other fugitives across the state and over state lines if necessary.

"This is unprecedented," said **Antonio C. Amador**, the U.S. Marshal for the Eastern District of California, who conducted the swearing-in. "We've never done this before statewide."

Some of the corrections department's fugitive apprehension teams began collaborating with the U.S. Marshals Service in 2003 in Los Angeles County. That effort also has involved other state and local law enforcement agencies as part of the Marshals' Pacific Southwest Regional Fugitive Task Force created under the Presidential Threat Protection Act of 2000. That partnership later expanded to Fresno and other parts of the state, Amador said.

ZIMMERMAN HONORED IN INDIANA

The Order of Augustus Award was presented to **Eric Zimmerman**, Chief Probation Officer for the Allen County Adult Probation Department in Indiana, on May 25, 2006, during the annual conference of the Probation Officers' Professional Association of Indiana (POPPI) in Indianapolis. The award is named in honor of **John Augustus**, the Boston shoemaker credited with being the "father of probation" in America.

Zimmerman, who serves as President of POPAI, has devoted more than two decades to the probation profession. He received the award for his leadership in and his dedication to the field of probation.

Zimmerman's "innovative thinking and cooperative approach to all partners in the criminal justice system has enhanced the quality of probation services throughout Indiana," said Allen County Circuit Court Judge **Thomas Felts**.

NEW PROBATION AND PAROLE HEAD IN ALASKA

In May 2006 Governor **Frank H. Murkowski** appointed **Donna White** as the new Director of the Division of Probation and Parole of the Alaska Department of Corrections. White, who has served as acting director of the division since April, has been with the agency since 1982.

White began her career with the agency as a correctional officer at the Palmer Correctional Center. A year later she became an institutional probation officer, a position she held until 1987, when she was promoted to a supervisory position and assigned a field position.

The division oversees approximately 120 employees and supervises 5,200 offenders. In addition, the division is responsible for victim services, sex offender oversight, interstate compact, and maintaining cooperative relationships with area law enforcement agencies.

"Donna White brings a wealth of experience to this position, and we are fortunate to have her on board," said **Marc Antrim**, Commissioner of Corrections.

HOWARD LEAGUE RELEASES REPORT ON BRITISH CORRECTIONAL EFFORTS

According to a report released on May 8, 2006, by the Howard League for Penal Reform, the British public "is being put at risk by government failures to tackle re-offending."

Out for Good: The Resettlement Needs of Young Men in Prison is the largest investigation into young offenders (18-20 years old) to have been undertaken in England and Wales. The report finds that despite young men having the highest rate of offending and re-offending, they have been largely ignored by government initiatives to cut crime.

The research was conducted in three, geographically diverse, institutions for young offenders; 86 young men took part in the study.

Every month over a thousand young men are sent to prison in England and Wales. It costs approximately \$65,000 a year for each offender incarcerated, yet the study found that little constructive work takes place in prison or on release, and nearly 70% of those released from prison will be reconvicted within two years. The research shows that many young men in prison had significant problems, including violent and abusive backgrounds, and had extensive experiences of poverty.

The report calls for a fundamental change in the way services are delivered to young men in order to reduce their offending. Prison was found to confirm a criminal identity rather than helping the young men reject offending.

Participants in the study were asked what would help them stop committing crime; their responses included:

- Gaining employment (55%)
- Having stable housing (26%)
- Being in a relationship (24%)
- Having a child (20%)
- Having positive family relations (20%)
- Managing their drug use (17%)
- Managing their alcohol use (15%)

Out for Good concludes that the current operation of the criminal justice system does little to ensure that young adult offenders make amends for what they have done or recognize the impact of their behavior on individual victims, their families, and the wider community. The report provides a number of recommendations, including:

- Greater use of community sentences
- Young adult offenders should make amends for their crimes
- All young adult offenders should have access to an advocate
- Family mediation should be offered to all young adult offenders
- The Rehabilitation of Offenders Act of 1974 should be repealed
- The government should carry out a public education campaign
- There should be improved access to substance abuse services
- The government urgently needs to review current housing legislation
- Educational and employment opportunities should be improved

- Resettlement services for offenders should be more widely available

In commenting on her report, Howard League's **Finola Farrant** said: "Young men are responsible for a significant amount of crime. However, our research shows that sending these young men to prison does virtually nothing to ensure that they will lead crime free lives on release, or worse, it makes their re-offending all the more predictable. There is an urgent need for the Home Secretary, and indeed many other government departments, to take responsibility for this failure to tackle re-offending. Such criminal neglect of young offenders puts the public at risk of further offending."

The Howard League for Penal Reform, founded in 1866 as the Howard Association, is the first penal reform organization in the United Kingdom. It is named after **John Howard**, the founder of the prison reform movement.

DIRECTOR NAMED TO LEAD THE CORRECTIONAL MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE OF TEXAS

A veteran corrections professional who has overseen the operations of Texas' 106 prison facilities for the last three years has joined Sam Houston State University (SHSU) as the Executive Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas (CMIT).

Douglas Dretke, Director of the Correctional Institutions Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ), became the new Executive Director of CMIT on July 1, 2006. The Institute's founding Executive Director, **Dan Richard Beto**, retired in August 2005 following close to forty years of service to the criminal justice system, and for the past ten months **Christie Davidson** has served as Interim Executive Director.

"It's been an honor to serve the agency, especially these last few years as the director of the Correctional Institutions Division," said Dretke. "I've worked with so many incredibly talented and dedicated individuals who have tirelessly worked to promote public safety, and I respect them immensely.

"During my tenure with TDCJ, we have enjoyed a close relationship with Sam Houston State University and CMIT and I look forward to this tremendous opportunity. It will allow me to continue to focus on the field of corrections and on the ever-important component of correctional leadership development."

"Dan Beto has been a true leader in Texas corrections," Dretke said. "It is a tremendous honor to follow someone of Dan Beto's stature."

Dretke began his career with TDCJ in 1980 as an entry level correctional officer. He quickly began working his way through the ranks, achieving the status of major, warden, regional director and finally Director of the Correctional Institutions Division in 2003. In that capacity, he has overseen the operations of TDCJ's 106 prison units across the state, as well as the support operations critical to those units, including security systems, training, transportation, food service, and classification and records.

A past President of the Texas Corrections Association, Dretke has been active with the National Institute of Corrections and the American Correctional Association as a presenter on different prison issues. He also is a member of a national workgroup with the National Institute of Justice dealing with correctional technology needs and development.

Dretke earned a Masters in Public Administration with a concentration in criminal justice from Texas A&M University at Corpus Christi in 2001. He also is a 1980 graduate of SHSU, where he earned his bachelor's degree in Criminology and Corrections.

The Correctional Management Institute of Texas was established in 1994. It is responsible for the development and delivery of professional training programs for personnel working in the juvenile and adult institutional and community corrections agencies. In delivering its varied training programs, the Institute has developed collaborative partnerships with adult and juvenile probation departments, Texas Department of Criminal Justice, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, Texas Youth Commission, and the National Institute of Corrections.

In addition to providing much of the training for the Texas corrections profession, the Institute serves as the secretariat for a number of professional organizations, including the National Association of Probation Executives, Texas Jail Association, Texas Probation Association, and the Texas Association for Court Administration.

NATIONAL PAROLE AND PROBATION CONVENTION HELD IN THE PHILIPPINES

On May 2-5, 2006, a multi-faceted activity for the Parole and Probation Administration (PPA) officers, with a focus on training and sports, was held in Bacolod City, Philippines.

Hosted by PPA Region 6, the 10th Probation and Parole Officers League of the Philippines National Convention, the 8th National Training Institute, and the 3rd National Sports Development Program were simultaneously held with Department of Justice Undersecretary **Ernesto Pineda** serving as the keynote speaker.

Centered on the theme "Meeting the Challenges of the PPA in the Global Community," the convention, attended by more than 600 parole and probation officers throughout the country, presented an opportunity for networking and professional development. Some of the discussions covered during the convention included the role of the probation officer in the imposition of the death penalty and "compassion fatigue."

Meanwhile, the sports competition, held at the Bacolod Panaad Sports Complex and the Golden Field Commercial Complex, included ball games, larong pinoy, table tennis, athletics, and bowling. The sporting events were designed to foster teamwork, leadership, and camaraderie among the participants and to bolster their self-confidence.

The Philippines Parole and Probation Administration, a branch of the Department of Justice, is comprised of 15 regions and 221 field offices.

INTERNAL CANDIDATE APPOINTED DIRECTOR IN HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS

On June 20, 2006, following a nation-wide search, the judges of Harris County, Texas, appointed **Paul Becker** as the new Director of the Harris County Community Supervision and Corrections Department. Becker, who has recorded approximately two decades of service in community corrections, replaces **Kim Valentine**, who has managed the department in an interim capacity for the past year following the termination of **Paul Donnelly**. She will resume her position as Deputy Director of Operations for the Houston based department.

Becker began his career as an interviewer for the Harris County Pretrial Services Agency; he went on to become Deputy Director before joining the probation department in 1991. In the probation department he held positions of increasing responsibility.

The Harris County Community Supervision and Corrections Department is staffed by over 800 employees and serves 22 district courts and 15 county criminal courts at law.

NEW SUPERVISION STRATEGY ANNOUNCED IN QUEENSLAND

Premier **Peter Beattie** of Queensland, Australia, has announced a new system of supervising high risk offenders on parole. According to an article appearing in *The Sunday Mail*, 16 surveillance officers would work with the Department of Corrective Services Intelligence Group to identify which offenders would be targeted with surveillance activities under the new system.

Under the new scheme, commencing in August, offenders on parole could be monitored 24 hours a day, seven days a week, with possible spot checks, surveillance, and random drug tests by officers in a fleet of vans. The surveillance officers might keep watch from a vehicle from the offender's home, or conduct random "doorknocks" to question parolees about their compliance with release conditions or curfews.

A team of five Corrective Services intelligence officers will analyze the risk of parolees reoffending. According to Corrective Services Minister **Judy Spence**, the new intelligence officers will work closely with police and Corrective Services program staff. She said their role is an extension of the work of existing intelligence officers within the jails who gather information about prisoners at risk of causing trouble inside prisons.

"Queensland would be the first state to introduce the network of intelligence officers in the community," said Beattie. This program is "about making it clear to offenders that they will be scrutinized while they are on community-based orders and if they slip up, they will face going back to jail."

NAPE MEMBERS ASSUME LEADERSHIP ROLES IN THE TEXAS CORRECTIONS ASSOCIATION

In June 2006, at the annual conference of the Texas Corrections Association held in Corpus Christi, Texas, **Bryan Collier**, Director of the Parole Division of the Texas Department of Criminal Justice, assumed the office of President of the association.

Collier began his career with the prison system while a student at Sam Houston State University. Following graduation in 1986, he became a correctional officer. He became interested in the parole aspect of corrections and after advancing through assignments with increased responsibility he was named Director of the Parole Division in January 2002. His division, with 67 offices and approximately 2,500 employees, is responsible for supervising close to 80,000 offenders.

During the conference, **Leighton Iles**, another NAPE member, was elected President-elect. Iles, a career community corrections professional, is Director of the Fort Bend County Community Supervision and Corrections Department headquartered in Rosenberg, Texas.

The Texas Corrections Association is dedicated to advancing quality correctional practices through professional growth, leadership, mentorship, and education.

Executive Exchange

NEW CHIEF APPOINTED IN COLORADO'S 16th DISTRICT

On July 1, 2006, **Tobin Wright** became the Chief Probation Officer for the 16th Judicial District in Colorado, which includes Bent, Crowley, and Otero Counties. Prior to his new assignment, Wright was a probation supervisor for the 21st Judicial District in Mesa County.

Wright, who earned a Bachelor of Arts degree and a Master of Science degree in psychology from Fort Hays State University in Hays, Kansas, has worked in probation and related fields since 1988. His previous positions, all of which occurred in Kansas, included service as a court services officer, forensic counselor in a sexual predator treatment program, psychologist at a juvenile correctional facility, intensive supervision officer, and director of a county community corrections program.

The new chief will oversee a staff of ten employees responsible for supervising adult and juvenile offenders. The department currently supervises 394 adult offenders and 96 juveniles.

BOSTON MULTI-AGENCY PARTNERSHIP

A relatively new multi-agency partnership may be found in Boston, Massachusetts. The Boston Regional Intelligence Center (BRIC) was launched in 2005 and is housed in the headquarters of the Boston Police Department. BRIC is staffed by sworn officers and civilian crime analysts who provide Boston and other regional law enforcement partners with current data concerning recent crimes, crime trends, and the activities of specific offenders.

Every morning, Monday through Friday, commencing at 10:00 AM, representatives of the area criminal justice system meet to review crimes and significant events occurring over the past 24 hours. Likewise, trends are discussed; these discussions are led by one or more of the crime analysts assigned to BRIC.

In addition to various divisions within the Boston Police Department, agencies represented at these daily briefings include probation, parole, U.S. Attorney's Office, Suffolk County House of Corrections, state police, transit police, school police, task forces, local prosecutors, federal agencies, corporate security, and area police departments.

Following the briefing provided by the crime analysts, each agency represented has an opportunity to provide those present any additional information. During this period information concerning recently released offenders from incarceration is disseminated. In addition, photographs and identifying information about defendants, probationers, and parolees with outstanding warrants are also shared. Too, future events that might provide opportunities for crime are identified and strategies discussed.

Dorchester Chief Probation Officer **Bernard Fitzgerald**, who regularly attends these daily briefings, said "these meetings provide a wealth of information and help develop relationships essential for the delivery of probation services and the promotion of public safety."

Every afternoon those agencies that are members of BRIC receive a secure report via the Internet that provides a summary of the briefing along with comprehensive data for the past 24 hours.

In addition to the daily intelligence briefings, every-other Wednesday afternoon the Boston Police Department hosts a meeting for area criminal justice practitioners devoted to gangs and youth violence. This bi-weekly meeting begins at 4:00 PM and

usually last for two hours. It is not uncommon for this meeting to have 100 persons in attendance.

The combined efforts of the law enforcement and criminal justice agencies in Boston and surrounding communities provide an excellent example of a successful multi-agency partnership.

SUPREME COURT CLARIFIES STANDARD FOR CONDUCTING SEARCHES OF PAROLEES

On June 19, 2006, the United States Supreme Court, in a 6-3 decision, issued an opinion that makes it easier to conduct searches of California parolees. In addition, the Supreme Court implied that the standard for conducting searches of parolees is different from that of searches of probationers. In *Samson v. California*, ___ U.S. ___ (2006) No. 04-9728, a police officer with the San Bruno Police Department stopped an individual on parole whom the officer believed had an outstanding parole warrant. After determining that the individual did not have a warrant for his apprehension, the officer nevertheless conducted a search of the individual's person. The officer found a plastic baggie on the parolee that contained methamphetamine. The parolee was subsequently convicted of possession of methamphetamine and sentenced to seven years in prison.

After exhausting his state appeals, the parolee brought his complaint regarding the legality of the search to the United States Supreme Court. The Supreme Court then considered the issue regarding whether a search of a parolee conducted pursuant to a condition of release had to be based on reasonable suspicion or whether the search could be considered reasonable for purposes of the Fourth Amendment even if based on no suspicion that the individual was engaged in criminal activity or was in violation of his conditions of release. The Supreme Court concluded that the Fourth Amendment did not prohibit a police officer from conducting a suspicionless search of a parolee.

The Court, in resolving this matter, noted that the State of California has a statute which required every prisoner eligible for release on state parole to "agree in writing to be subject to search or seizure by a parole officer or other peace officer . . . with or without a search warrant and with or without cause." The Court further noted that a California penal statute provided that "it is not the intent of the Legislature to authorize law enforcement officers to conduct searches for the sole purpose of harassment" and California case law prohibited "arbitrary, capricious or harassing" searches of probationers and parolees.

In deciding this matter the Supreme Court made a very important distinction between probationers and parolees. The Court observed that on a continuum of state-imposed punishments, "parolees have fewer expectations of privacy than probationers, because parole is more akin to imprisonment than probation is to imprisonment." Hence the Court reasoned that on the continuum of possible punishments, parole was the stronger "medicine" and thus parolees enjoyed even less of the average citizen's absolute liberty than did probationers. As such the Court concluded that parolees had severely diminished expectations of privacy by virtue of their status alone and they could be subject to searches without the need of individualized suspicion.

The Court stated that in its decision of *United States v. Knights*, 534 U.S. 112 (2001), which approved a search of a probationer conducted pursuant to a condition of probation and based on reasonable suspicion, it had left open the question concerning whether a condition of release could so diminish or eliminate a

released prisoner's reasonable expectation of privacy that a suspicionless search by a law enforcement officer would not offend the Fourth Amendment. That question has now been answered in the affirmative in its decision in *Samson*. However the Court has appeared to have created two different standards for conducting searches of probationers and parolees. Even if the wording of the search condition might be identical in both situations and even be based on identical statutory language, nevertheless the Court inferred that searches of probationers must be based on reasonable suspicion while searches of parolees did not. Finally this case may be somewhat of an anomaly since the Court observed that most jurisdictions in the country require a search conducted pursuant to a condition of release to be based on some level of suspicion while the California statute does not.

RICKETTS RETIRES IN NEW YORK

On June 28, 2006, following more than two decades in the position, longtime NAPE member **Mike Ricketts** retired as Director of the Chautauqua County Probation Department in Jamestown, New York.

Ricketts joined the department in 1973 as a probation officer, following two years of service with the Allegany County Probation Department. During his tenure in Chautauqua County, Ricketts served as a probation officer, senior probation officer, and as a supervisor before being named to head the department.

During his administration, Ricketts established Spanish-speaking and probation assistant positions as well as a minority group specialist position to better meet the needs of the department's clientele. In addition, he focused on officer safety needs and training to better prepare staff to deal with the complexity of the offender's needs. He instituted the use of a risk-needs assessment instrument for both adult and juvenile offenders so that they received the required level of supervision and treatment. For enhanced offender accountability, Ricketts initiated the use of electronic monitoring.

In addition to his duties in Chautauqua County, Ricketts was also active at the state level. He served as President of the New York State Council of Probation Administrators.

County Executive **Greg Edwards**, quoted in the *Jamestown Post-Journal*, said: "Mike has been a tremendous asset to this county and will be greatly missed. I enjoyed working with him during my 18 years as an attorney. I appreciate what he brought to the county and being able to work with him. I look forward to working with him in the community."

In retirement, Ricketts said he plans to remain active in the community and enjoy his family. He and his wife have two adult daughters and sons-in-law, as well as a grandson. Despite being retired, he wants to remain active with NAPE and continue to receive *Executive Exchange* and various mailings.

MONTANA FEDERAL JUDGE ORDERS PUBLIC SHAMING FOR LYING TO PROBATION OFFICER

Articles appearing in the *Helena Independent Record* and the *Missoulian* report that on July 6, 2006, Chief U.S. District Judge **Don Molloy** in Missoula, Montana, ordered a defendant who lied about his military service to march outside the courthouse wearing a sandwich board that says, "I am a liar. I am not a Marine."

William C. Horvath, age 36, of Whitefish, pleaded guilty to

making false statements to his probation officer about having served in the U.S. Marine Corps in hopes of earning compassion. The officer was gathering information on a prior charge against Horvath for being a fugitive in possession of firearms or ammunition. Hoping to temper the consequences of those charges, the defendant claimed he had been wounded in combat and showed the officer photographs with him in full military dress. Representatives of the U.S. Marine Corps, however, said there was no record of Horvath's military service and said the uniform and its decorations were worn improperly.

The judge, a military veteran, sentenced Horvath to four years probation, four months of house arrest with electronic monitoring, and required him to perform 50 hours of community service by marching or walking in front of the courthouse during business hours wearing a sandwich board with "large letters."

The front of the board is to read: "I am a liar. I am not a Marine." And on the back, it is to read: "I have never served my country. I have dishonored veterans of all wars."

In addition, the judge ordered Horvath to write letters of apology to newspapers, the U.S. Marine Corps, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the American Legion in Kalispell. In the letters the defendant must admit he lied repeatedly about serving in the military and being wounded.

Tristan Scott of the *Missoulian* writes: "In fashioning the portion of Horvath's sentence that addressed donning a sandwich board, Molloy followed a 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals decision in which **Shawn Gementera**, a convicted mail thief in California, was ordered to stand outside a post office for 1200 hours wearing a sign that said: 'I am a convicted mail thief. This is my punishment.' The case eventually supported the use of humiliation or so-called 'shaming' conditions, and explicitly holds that 'a public apology may serve a rehabilitative purpose.' In 2005, Gementera asked the U.S. Supreme Court to review the decision, and the Supreme Court declined."

LOS ANGELES CHURCHES UNITE TO COMBAT JOBLESSNESS AMONG AFRICAN AMERICANS

Pastors from some of the largest churches in South Los Angeles, California, churches united on Tuesday, June 27, 2006, to kick off an initiative geared toward finding employment for African-American men who they believe are underrepresented in the county's workforce.

The United Job Creation Initiative seeks to find construction jobs for men who were at one time incarcerated and are now looking to make a positive contribution in their communities, said **Jean Franklin**, the initiative's executive director.

"We know a lot of people aren't interested in construction jobs, but we are targeting construction jobs because they are sensitive to the needs of the [formerly incarcerated]," said Franklin following a Tuesday morning news conference at city hall. The initiative seeks to set aside 30 percent of those jobs for "at-risk individuals" living in communities where construction projects are planned or under way, she said.

Beginning Sunday, members of several South L.A. churches will be asked to sign petitions asking the L.A. City Council to approve an ordinance that would establish "set aside" construction jobs for people in the communities where projects are being built. Churches involved include City of Refuge, West Angeles Church of God in Christ, Crenshaw Christian Center, First and Second African Methodist Episcopal Churches, the Full Harvest Inter-

national Church, and Christ Liberty Tabernacle. An August 31st deadline has been set for the collection of 180,000 signatures.

"I think the church has taken enough and it's time for the church to give something back," said **Noel Jones**, pastor of the City of Refuge. "We have to give something back that is significant to changing people's lives. We understand the plight. We understand the issue before us. And we realize that we have to do something about it," Jones said. "We must do it to make our [entire] community better."

Following the petition drive, Franklin said, a November 4th United Job Creation Summit will be held at the City of Refuge, bringing together churches and community-based organizations.

"This is the first time the large, medium, and small L.A. churches have endeavored to team up to leverage the spiritual and civic power of our congregations to make a public request of elected officials and employers to put our people to work," Jones said. "We must have viable employment and livable wages to effectively dismantle the 'cradle-to-prison-to early death pipeline' that entraps a disproportionate number of African-American, Latino and other disenfranchised residents."

"We can break the cycle of repeat criminal offenders through jobs and education," added **Brad Carson**, a deputy probation officer and a supporter of the initiative. "And we can achieve the quality of life issues through jobs and education for absolutely everyone."

During Tuesday's news conference, Councilman **Herb Wesson** told the assembled clergy that Mayor **Antonio Villaraigosa** was a supporter of their efforts. "I personally will be a partner with you and the mayor to use whatever influences and relationships that I have," Wesson said. "I am committed to this as you are."

HAMM NAMED PROBATION DIRECTOR IN MONTGOMERY COUNTY, TEXAS

Pat Hamm, who has devoted his entire career to community corrections, had been designated the new Director of the Montgomery County Department of Community Supervision and Corrections in Conroe, Texas. He succeeds **Melvin Brown, Jr.**, who retires on August 31, 2006, after 26 years in the position.

Presently in charge of the county's residential treatment center, Hamm has moved up the career ladder since becoming a probation officer with the department following his graduation from Sam Houston State University with a degree in criminal justice. In addition to serving as a probation officer, he held positions of increasing responsibility, such as unit supervisor, information systems supervisor, quality development supervisor, and director of community corrections.

"It's the only job I've ever had," said Hamm. "The coursework in college interested me. It's been pretty rewarding because you get to help people."

District Judge **Fred Edwards** noted that Hamm had "an overwhelming amount of support from his coworkers throughout the selection process." He added, "That made a big difference with me and all the judges. He is well liked and respected."

DELAWARE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS FOCUS ON MAKING STREETS SAFE

As reported in an article appearing in the July 3, 2006, edition of *The News Journal*, the newspaper serving New Castle-Wilm-

ington, while it has been only a month since the New Castle County police began partnering with state probation and parole officers in their Safe Streets Program, officials have started seeing significant success from curfew checks and pedestrian stops. The county's two Safe Street teams have made numerous arrests and seized 11.4 ounces of marijuana, 15 grams of cocaine, assorted prescription drugs obtained illegally, ammunition, weapons, and drug money, said **Trinidad Navarro**, a police spokesman. "These officers are not 911-driven, which gives them the opportunity to be proactive."

The New Castle County program follows in the footsteps of the Wilmington Police Department, which initiated Operation Safe Streets in 1997 after a record number of shootings the previous year. Delaware State Police joined forces with state probation and parole officers in 1999, implementing the same program under the name of the Governor's Task Force. Now all three agencies have dedicated officers trained to crack down on probation violators before they have an opportunity to commit new crimes.

"There are a lot more people doing it so they can be in more places simultaneously," said **Pat Cronin**, Probation and Parole Supervisor who oversees the state's eight probation officers in New Castle County. The probation and parole officers are now teamed with law enforcement officers from three area agencies.

The program in New Castle County, which commenced June 1, 2006, teams two county police officers with two probation officers to target the New Castle Avenue corridor between Wilmington and New Castle, which typically sees increased crime during the summer months. "The officers are not limited to that area," said **Scott McLaren**, acting county police chief. "That was our targeted area of concern, but they can go where the crime takes them."

The county's Operation Safe Streets initiative is supported by a federal grant. "In the long term, it's a money-saving effort because we're attacking the crimes before they happen," McLaren said. "It's hard to put a price tag on that."

Cronin said adding more officers to the Safe Streets teams has been reaping dividends. Wilmington's Operation Safe Street teams have confiscated 118 firearms between 1999 and 2005. State police teams have made 231 gun seizures during the same period. According to Cronin, so far this year the city's team has seized 40 firearms, and the Governor's Task Force has collected another 24.

"A lot of what you do is look for technical violations for probationers under supervision," Cronin said. "Enforcing probation conditions identifies new criminal activity that you can act on, which has an impact on violent crime, because these are the people we are focusing on."

The continued enforcement often leads to new charges for gun and drug offenses. "Unfortunately, many of the homicides are being committed by people involved in drugs and in possession of deadly weapons," Cronin added.

McLaren said targeting the "worst of the worst" probationers has begun paying off. "A lot of times we're finding out that these people are repeat offenders," he said.

Although the city, county, and state police are now all actively working with their own Safe Streets programs, "they are not duplicating any investigatory activity," said McLaren. "The communication has been enhanced because of the common denominator of probation and parole participation."

"Another benefit," Cronin said, "is that multiple partnerships offer the participants greater access to resources that can be used more efficiently."
