

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

WINTER 1997

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE



This edition of *Executive Exchange* contains three primary articles addressing significantly different topics, all timely and of interest to probation executives.

First, Dot Faust shares an interesting perspective on leadership in community corrections. She and Norm Helber, both of the Maricopa County Adult Probation Department in Phoenix, Arizona, presented a workshop entitled "They're Looking For Leaders: Why Not Us?" at the 1996 American Probation and Parole Association Training Institute. Their presentation was popular and shared insights that I think you will find interesting. Dot's article shares the results of a survey she and Norm did for their APPA presentation that compares leadership traits in current literature to leadership traits recognized in current community corrections leaders.

Two frequently independent but critical topics today are Community Corrections Acts and restorative justice. Mary Shilton, a criminal justice planner who writes many informative articles regarding corrections, has researched and written about the development of Community Corrections Acts for the National Institute of Corrections, and Kay Prantis, who heads up the restorative justice initiative for the Minnesota Department of Corrections, recognize a relationship between these two concepts. Both have

joined in this edition of *Executive Exchange* to address the relationship and answer specific questions that probation executives will find interesting if they are dealing with Community Corrections Acts and/or restorative justice programs.

It is not often that community corrections programs receive recognition for innovation in government from outside correctional circles. In December 1996, the Neighborhood Based Supervision (NBS) Program, generated in partnership between the Washington State Department of Corrections and the Spokane Police Department, received an award for innovation from the Council of State Governments. An article identifying this program and suggesting issues probation executives need to consider in developing similar programs is authored by Jack Brucick, a Community Corrections Officer in West Central Spokane. Being from Washington, I am particularly proud of this program and its recognition, given that our Mobile Intervention Supervision Team (MIST) Program received the same recognition the previous year. Good going Washington State Department of Corrections' staff!

As you encounter those who have contributed to this edition of *Executive Exchange*, please join me in expressing appreciation for their work. Thank you.

Dave Savage
President

CONTENTS

President's Message, <i>Dave Savage</i>	1
They're Looking for Leaders: Why Not Us?, <i>Dorothy Faust</i>	2
Community Corrections Acts and Restorative Justice, <i>Mary Shilton and Kay Prantis</i>	4
Neighborhood Based Supervision, <i>Jack Brucick</i>	8
News From the Field	9

INFORMATION ABOUT EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

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

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

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

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

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

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

THEY'RE LOOKING FOR LEADERS: WHY NOT US?

by
Dorothy Faust
Deputy Chief
Maricopa County Adult Probation Department
Phoenix, Arizona

At the 1996 American Probation and Parole Association Training Institute in Chicago, Illinois, Chief Probation Officer Norman Helber, Robert Cherkos of our Programs staff and I (all from Maricopa County, Arizona) decided to make a presentation that would inspire community corrections professionals to step up to the plate and lead. More than ever before, we have access to formal program evaluations and empirical studies that teach us about interventions that work. Most of our departments have taken advantage of this information to develop better policies and programs. There appear to be plenty of capable managers to enforce these policies and implement the new program plans. Without a leader's guiding vision of what the future should be, our most talented managers will merely continue to find ways to jam the new findings into yesterday's organizational structures and accepted program designs. Working within these safe, enclosed boundaries limits what our profession can accomplish.

To encourage more of our fellow professionals to accept the challenge of a leadership role, we first tried to define leadership itself. We read what Warren Bennis says about true leaders, and then compared his ideas with the leadership characteristics of recognized visionaries in community corrections.

Ideas on Leadership from Warren Bennis

In his book *On Becoming A Leader*, Warren Bennis writes that a leader is someone who gets the best from people by empowering them, supporting them, and getting out of their way (p. xiii). A leader, he says, puts emphasis on ideas, on relationships and on adventure (p. xiv). A leader forms an overarching, guiding vision (pp. 6, 39). Leaders learn from failure (p. 26), Bennis emphasizes, and view mistakes as part of progress (p. 96). Bennis talks about leaders' ability to express themselves. Leaders know themselves and what they want (p. 3).

The rest of us look for direction, trust, and hope from our leaders (*On Becoming A Leader*, p. xiii). Trust is pivotal, Bennis says, in today's changing world. This trust (p. xiii) has three ingredients: ambition, competence and integrity (p. xiv). Although ambition and competence can help gain prominence, Bennis cautions, a person may well succeed only in the short term without exhibiting a strong moral fiber (pp. xiii-xiv). We seem to have a need to know what persons are made of inside before we're willing to follow them or to buy their vision.

Bennis has identified four ingredients that generate this trust (p. 160). One of these is constancy: leaders stay the course. They don't drift from the message. Another is congruity (walking-the-talk). Reliability is a third component; and finally, there's integrity again. Leaders are perceived to be honest and consistent. They honor their commitments.

Bennis is careful throughout the book to differentiate leadership from management. Management is a set of valuable skills, he says, that may be taught in graduate school. Leadership, on the other hand, cannot be taught (p. 73). Managers take charge of everyday operations, but leaders create visions and "master the context" (p. 44). In other words, managers help the organization to implement the vision painted by their leader. Bennis makes the following contrasts between leaders and managers (p. 45):

- The manager administers; the leader innovates.
- The manager is a copy; the leader is an original.
- The manager maintains; the leader develops.
- The manager focuses on systems and structure; the leader focuses on people.
- The manager relies on control; the leader inspires trust.
- The manager has a short-range view; the leader has a long range perspective.
- The manager asks how and when; the leader asks what and why.
- The manager has his eye always on the bottom line; the leader has his eye on the horizon.
- The manager imitates; the leader originates.
- The manager accepts the status quo; the leader challenges it.
- The manager is the classic good soldier; the leader is his own person.
- The manager does things right; the leader does the right thing.

Leadership Survey

Once we considered the characteristics of leadership as identified by Warren Bennis, we surveyed some prominent community corrections professionals to find out how they defined leadership within our field.

We sent a very concise, informal questionnaire to the APPA Executive Committee, members of the APPA Board of Directors, the Urban Chief's Network and some recognized researchers and writers in the community corrections arena.

We simply asked: "Who are three of the top leaders in community corrections and why?" When the responses were tallied, the following words had been written to describe today's community correction leaders:

- Steadfast/Constant/Consistent/Unstinting
- Innovative
- Visible/Recognized
- Outspoken/Advocate
- Knowledgeable
- Visionary
- Enthusiastic
- Thoughtful
- Creative
- Dedicated

Also mentioned to a slightly lesser degree were these characteristics:

- Risk taking
- Energetic
- Politically astute
- Initiative
- Committed
- Consensus Builder
- Vocal
- Responsible
- Articulate

The factors that Bennis found when he studied leaders from a variety of businesses and disciplines were very similar to the qualities identified by professionals in our field of community corrections. It is also interesting, though, that a relatively small number of leaders in our field were identified.

In fact, many in the audience at the workshop were not able to describe leadership development efforts within their home departments. There were some notable exceptions from executives attending the workshop who not only encouraged innovation and the expression of new ideas but actually expected it. New employees in these organizations were informed of these expectations from their first days on the job. Many of those listening to the workshop discussion, however, were line staff from other jurisdictions who didn't feel that leadership was being encouraged at their levels or modeled by their supervisors.

The challenge for executives in our profession, then, seems to be twofold: first, making the choice to take on leadership roles ourselves; and, second, identifying those with leadership potential at all levels and nurturing their development. In the current social and political climate, there's nothing more important for NAPE members to be doing.

Reference

Bennis, Warren. *On Becoming a Leader*. Addison-Wesley Publishing Company. 1994.

COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS ACTS
AND RESTORATIVE JUSTICE

by
Mary Shilton
Criminal Justice Planner
Alexandria, Virginia
and
Kay Pranis
Restorative Justice Planner
Minnesota Department of Corrections
St. Paul, Minnesota

In this combined effort Mary Shilton and Kay Pranis supply a wealth of information about the relationship between Community Corrections Acts and the restorative justice concept by providing thoughtful responses to several pertinent questions.

1. What are the objectives of Community Corrections Acts?

Shilton

Community Corrections Acts (CCAs) are statewide initiatives, authorized by legislation, granting funding and operational responsibilities to local units of government and community agencies to accomplish a wide array of correctional tasks. Most CCAs include a range of financial, structural, programmatic, political, sentencing-related, and evaluation objectives. CCAs are comprehensive in scope and thus give the cognizant and participating agencies latitude in implementing programs that meet both state and local requirements.

Improved resource allocation: All CCAs create subsidies to provide decentralized correctional services. This subsidy program supports a number of financial goals such as more effective use of resources, efficiency, cost-avoidance, and improved coordination of existing agency services. Through annual planning and budgeting processes, states and counties allocate funding for diversion, intermediate punishments, and post-incarceration transitional programs.

Structural reform: CCAs generally coordinate justice services through a statewide Board or designated agency. They typically shift correctional responsibility for eligible offenders to local governments and agencies. Many, though not all, CCAs provide for community involvement in program development and oversight. It is not unusual for CCAs to fund programs through probation agencies. They sometimes decentralize or consolidate probation functions. They may also fund private agencies and county programs.

Programmatic options: CCAs embrace a wide range of options including reduction of prison or jail commitments. The earliest CCAs primarily funded rehabilitative programs, while the most recent ones are more likely to fund accountability options such as intensive probation, partial confinement, residential living, and a range of work and restitution initiatives. The range of programs in CCA states can be quite extensive. For example, in Ohio in 1993, there were four types of educational programs, five types of employment programs, five

types of programs specific to offenses such as domestic violence or child abuse counseling, four types of drug and alcohol treatments, and seven other miscellaneous programs such as veterans' and mental health services. In addition to these there were four types of residential sanctions, nine non-residential sanctions, and nine financial sanctions supported by CCA and local funds. (See *Intermediate Sanctions in Ohio*, Oriana House Inc., 1993).

Political purposes: Many CCAs are designed to educate the public and involve elected officials at all levels of government in discussion about community-based sanctions. In Michigan, the Office of Community Corrections includes a public information program that provides information to community groups and victims. CCAs are unique in the corrections field because they recognize that political support is necessary to attain a full range of integrated oversight, and review of the statewide allocation of resources is required by most CCAs. Additionally, review of budget and programs by local elected and appointed officials occurs in many states. Such processes address sensitive public safety issues by creating a system of checks on offender services. Some CCAs limit participation to nonviolent or low-level offenders. Others allow CCA placements for all offenders, recognizing the need to transition even those who have been violent after they have served their period of incarceration.

Sentencing related goals: Most CCAs directly or indirectly recognize that sentencing policy should be exercised in favor of a community-based sentence in appropriate cases. Often CCAs are linked to implementation of sentencing reforms such as truth in sentencing legislation or sentencing guidelines. In North Carolina, structured sentencing reform was introduced to make it appropriate to sentence to community punishments in a wide variety of cases. In Virginia, community corrections placement occurs after an offender has been sentenced and placement is discretionary with the locality or the state agency.

Evaluation and reporting: CCAs are by nature innovative and require monitoring, reporting and evaluation. This may be accomplished through state performance audits, periodic legislative assessments or specific program evaluations. Until recently there was little cross-jurisdictional comparability between CCA programs and agencies. This impaired large scale program evaluation. However, there is a growing trend for states to collect uniform data such as number of prison and jail bound offenders diverted, fines and fees paid to the state, victims and families of the offender, and wages earned by employed offenders.

2. What is restorative justice?

Pranis

Restorative justice is not a program or a specific set of programs; it is a way of thinking about how to approach the problem of responding to crime, a set of values which guides decisions on policy, programs and practice. Restorative justice is based on a redefinition of crime as injury to the victim and community rather than affront to the power of the state. The primary purpose of the criminal justice system in the

restorative model is to repair the harm of the crime to the degree possible. Victim involvement or perspective (through surrogate victims or advocates when a victim does not wish to participate) is essential to define the harm of the crime and to identify how the harm might be repaired.

Restorative justice prioritizes support for victims, opportunities for victim input, offender involvement in repairing the harm of the behavior, offender involvement in repairing the harm where possible and community involvement in all aspects of resolving a criminal incident.

Restorative justice also assumes that communities are responsible for their members and that community health depends upon constructive responses to crime. The criminal justice system cannot deliver improved public safety without the active involvement of the community.

3. What is the relationship between restorative justice and Community Corrections Acts?

Shilton

Proponents of restorative justice have been involved in the development and refining of many state CCAs. For example, the CCAs in North Carolina, Florida, Alabama, California, and Michigan were all influenced by restorative justice advocates within the states. Restorative justice provides principles for guiding development of the criminal justice system to minimize harm and increase harmony. In contrast, CCAs accommodate a broad array of principles but provide the legal authority and means for better working relationships within the criminal justice system.

CCAs assume that there is a need for a range of correctional services at the local level that provide more options than prison, jail, or unsupervised probation. This notion supports collaboration among community members and agencies working through their local governments to provide an increase in public safety, and to rehabilitate offenders.

Most CCAs are based on adversarial justice concepts applied to local programs. Therefore, few have established statewide restorative justice projects such as Minnesota's; but many localities within the states have established community service, restitution, reconciliation and victims' assistance programs. With local collaboration emphasized, there is a growing shift in focus toward restorative programs. To move toward restorative justice, CCA states and localities involve citizens and victims at critical case decisions.

Restorative justice questions over-reliance on an adversarial system rather than one based on reconciliation. It emphasizes the role of individuals and communities over political entities and the state in resolving conflicts and dispensing justice. While CCAs also emphasize the role of communities and individuals in the justice process, they fall short of implementing restorative justice reforms. This is because most CCAs are not authorized to shift the focus and purposes of the sentencing process to a restorative system. Consequently, most CCAs have concentrated primarily on managing needs and risk of the offender and the correctional system.

Despite such differences, CCAs are compatible with restorative justice purposes because they are designed to increase

community involvement and commitment to repair harm done by crime. Restorative programs have started in CCA states like Minnesota and Iowa because of the commitment to comprehensive programs which include victims and citizens.

When CCAs begin to fully implement restorative justice concepts, they will implement such programs by:

- 1) directing needed funding and resources to the community level to provide staff to plan, and operate programs with a holistic approach;
- 2) authorizing and restructuring the case management process to allow for more balanced responses; for example, they may expand a range of sentencing options, provide for victim notification and participation in sentencing, establish programs for communication with the offender, engage citizens and other agencies concerned about the impact of crime and restoration of harmony within the community;
- 3) developing a range of programs designed to minimize harm to victims and communities while restoring and rehabilitating the offender within the community; for example, in states like Virginia the concept of local community boards that screen and place offenders could be expanded to a number of sentencing processes;
- 4) educating and involving the public and victims by creating programs that involve them in conciliation, dialogue, mediation, mentoring, advocacy and support for those individuals who have been confined in prison or jail;
- 5) reforming case processing to permit consideration of the victim and community;
- 6) assessing and evaluating what actions will create harmony, restore peace to victims, offenders, and communities.

Pranis

Restorative justice and Community Corrections Acts have significant natural affinity, though they are not necessarily linked. Community Corrections Acts place more of the criminal justice action at the community level, but those acts do not currently specify that those activities be restorative in their goals. It is possible to implement a community corrections system that is retributive in nature with the focus on punishment instead of repair of the harm. Restorative justice is based on a fundamental shift in the underlying assumptions of the criminal justice system. Community Corrections Acts make structural changes in funding and decision making but do not necessarily change the basic beliefs which drive the system.

Restorative justice takes several of the concepts of the community corrections movement one step further. The community corrections movement in the 1970's was based on three key ideas: 1) corrections should attend to the relationship between the offender and the community; 2) the community should assist in the work with the offender; and, 3) this approach should be used with property offenders.

Under the restorative justice philosophy those three ideas have evolved into the following: 1) the criminal justice system should attend to all of the broken relationships - between the offender and the community, the victim and the community and the victim and the offender; 2) the community should be the leader in the resolution of the criminal incident (not just a helper); and, 3) the philosophy of repairing harm and attending to victims should apply to all offenses. The common emphasis in both on community involvement makes community corrections a natural delivery mechanism for restorative justice.

4. What is the value added to the community and criminal justice system by these concepts?

Shilton

Community punishment options generally cost less per offender than prison or jail and states that systematically use such programs can avoid the cost of constructing new detention facilities. However, evaluations of most state CCAs indicate that they go far beyond managing unnecessary prison growth. The real benefits of CCAs are better coordinated programs, shared resources, public education and participation in the debate about punishment and involvement of the private sector in new programs.

Most CCAs authorize and develop offender accountability programs, rehabilitation, reintegration, repayment to the community and individual victim. For example in Iowa, CCA funding supports victim offender dialogue programs, restitution and other rehabilitative projects.

CCAs provide a statewide mechanism for state agencies and communities to discuss and evaluate how they provide correctional services. Products of CCAs include greater productivity in offender work, support of offender families through earning, reimbursement for room and board, and payment of fines, fees and restitution while under supervision. These financial benefits partially offset costs of community corrections programs.

Pranis

Community corrections moves decisions about resources and resource management closer to the community, which should generally improve the quality of the decisions. It provides greater opportunity for community input into the function of the corrections system. Restorative justice prioritizes strengthening of the community as an outcome of every criminal justice intervention. With its focus on repairing harm, restorative justice adds value to the community by requiring offenders to be actively involved in giving back to the community as well as the victim. Through facilitating repair of the harm and encouraging healing, restorative justice contributes to long term crime prevention for the community. All of the benefits to the community are also benefits to the criminal justice system because community satisfaction will rise with community benefits. In addition, restorative justice provides options for meaningful accountability which are less costly than traditional methods. Both approaches increase opportunity

nities to access the creativity and volunteer human resources of community members.

5. Are these concepts that will maintain over time or are they just passing trends?

Shilton

Community Corrections Acts will continue to be important over time because they make possible a range of non-incarcerative options administered in the community where the offender resides. Options like day reporting, work release, intensive supervision and community service are recognized as the first choice for nonviolent offenders and those who have served a sentence.

Perhaps the most lasting contribution of CCAs will be the engagement of communities in the debate over corrections choices. CCAs have changed a traditional assumption that prison is the preferred form of punishment for many nonviolent offenders and awakened communities to the potential of participating in the justice process.

In a 1994 survey of Victim Offender Reconciliation Programs, all programs except those with permanent state funding indicated that they lacked sufficient resources to meet the demand for services. If restorative justice programs such as Victim Offender Mediation are to develop, technical assistance, funding, training and evaluation must be available to assure they meet their goals. CCAs will continue to be useful in assuring that resources are available throughout a state for diversion, work, economic sanctions, family support, substance abuse treatment, and other nonincarcerative options.

Pranis

Community corrections has a 25-year history, while the widespread current interest in restorative justice is only a few years old. It is difficult to predict the path of such a fundamental change in our way of thinking, however, the shift represented by restorative justice is part of a larger shift in our social institutions from power-based structures and practices to relationship-based structures and practices. On one level it appears that movement is toward greater centralization of authority and greater use of retributive approaches, but at another level there are powerful forces moving in the opposite direction. This shift is evident in several fields. Community-based policing is based on building community relationships and using proactive problem solving techniques instead of brute force responses designed to demonstrate power over others.

The field of social work is struggling to shift from a deficit model, in which a beneficent outside power rescues an individual or community from weaknesses, to a capacity building model, in which individuals or communities rescue themselves based on their own strengths and relationships in the community. The total quality management transformation in business and industry is fundamentally a shift from motivating workers based on fear and power over them to motivating workers based on relationships and an opportunity to shape their own work lives. In the legal field the movement toward

greater use of alternative dispute resolutions processes rather than courts represents a similar shift from reliance upon the power and authority of the abstract law to reliance upon human relationships and interaction to reach agreement.

All of these processes give more power for finding solutions to those most directly involved and decrease reliance on fear of consequences as the primary mechanism of achieving desired behavior. Efforts to expand the use of restorative practice in the criminal justice system will be more effective if they are understood in the context of this substantial social change which is reshaping many of our institutions.

Restorative justice and community corrections are both more flexible than traditional approaches because decision making is decentralized and the context of the community is allowed to shape practices within the boundaries of fairness and due process. This flexibility allows the system to take advantage of community strengths in crafting constructive resolutions to criminal events.

Throughout the United States we are experiencing a resurgence in concern about a sense of community and connectedness among human beings. Community based solutions to all kinds of problems are gaining in credibility. It seems likely that this trend will grow in strength for the foreseeable future.

6. In jurisdictions where these concepts are working or under consideration, what challenges and opportunities do they provide probation executives?

Shilton

Probation executives are well-positioned to become involved in implementing a CCA with a restorative justice focus. In most CCA states, probation is active in shaping community punishments, sentencing reforms, and intermediate sanctions. In states like Minnesota and Iowa where probation has been part of a CCA funded initiative, a wide array of community-based programs have linked victims, offenders and their communities to the sanctioning process.

CCAs provide probation executives with the opportunity to develop assessments of community corrections funding efforts that incorporate answers to restorative justice goals as well as correctional ones. In CCA states, probation executives can develop statewide case management systems designed to provide current information to communities and victims as well as correctional risk and offender needs assessments necessary for program success. CCAs offer a forum for probation executives to work with sheriffs, private agencies, and other community providers to develop a web of related programs to better serve a community's priorities.

Pranis

The greatest challenge to probation executives is reconceptualizing the role of probation staff. Restorative justice calls for a different relationship among communities, victims, offenders and the system. In a restorative approach, probation staff facilitate processes in which community members work with offenders and sometimes victims. Traditional case management focuses on the relationship between the

offender and the probation agent. Restorative justice focuses on the relationship between the offender and the community and the victim. In a restorative approach corrections professionals are challenged to understand how their work can contribute to repairing harm for the victim and the community. To work effectively probation agents need to understand victimization more thoroughly; they need to know community resources; they need to have skills in organizing community involvement.

Though very challenging, restorative justice offers enormous opportunities for professional renewal and greater personal satisfaction with the job. In Minnesota numerous line staff and managers have expressed more excitement and interest in their work than they have felt for twenty years.

Restorative justice calls for shared responsibility for finding solutions to the problem of crime. For too long the criminal justice system has felt the burden of public safety on its shoulders alone. Real community ownership of the problem of crime and criminals brings a whole new array of resources and power to the process of managing the behavior of offending members of the community.

7. Whether planning, implementing or maintaining these types of community based justice concepts, where can probation executives turn for guidance and assistance in providing leadership for and within their agency?

Shilton

Many of the 25 states with Community Corrections Acts have state specialists and probation executives who are extremely knowledgeable about their states.

A number of national organizations have adopted policies or have written publications that favor Community Corrections Acts. Among them are the American Correctional Association, the American Bar Association, the International Community Corrections Association, the American Probation and Parole Association, the National Committee on Community Corrections and the National Association of Counties. The American Bar Association has approved a Model Adult Community Corrections Act that outlines many elements of successful CCAs. Most CCA publications can be obtained through the above referenced Associations, the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (800-851-3420) and the National Institute of Corrections Information Center (800-877-1461).

Upcoming conferences include the International Community Corrections Association's in September 1997 profiling issues and trends involving Community Corrections Acts states. For more information contact: Peter Kinziger, Executive Director, P.O. Box 1987, La Crosse, Wisconsin 54602 (608-785-0200).

Pranis

Following are resources for more information and technical assistance regarding restorative justice: American Probation and Parole Association; the Center for Restorative Justice and Mediation, University of Minnesota; National Institute of Corrections; Balanced and Restorative Justice Project of the Office

of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; National Institute of Justice; Minnesota Department of Corrections Restorative Justice Initiative; and, the Vermont Department of Corrections.

NEIGHBORHOOD BASED SUPERVISION: A PATHWAY TO THE FUTURE OF COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS

by
Jack Brucick
Community Corrections Officer
Washington State Department of Corrections
Spokane, Washington

The Department of Corrections, Division of Community Corrections, in Spokane, Washington, has developed and implemented a program, Neighborhood Based Supervision (NBS) which provides Community Corrections Officers (CCOs) the opportunity to move from bureaucratic settings and work directly within the community. They share office space with local police officers and other stakeholders, along with neighborhood volunteers, who are housed at Community Oriented Policing Substations (COPS). Being located in the neighborhoods, COPS Shops enable the CCOs to work cooperatively with police officers and community members, while supervising offenders on their caseloads who live in the neighborhoods.

History of the NBS Program

The creation of the Neighborhood Based Supervision Program is closely tied to the development of COPS Shops in Spokane. The COPS program was the direct result of a 1991 tragedy in which two young girls were abducted from their West-Central Spokane neighborhood. One girl was found dead; the other has never been found. The resulting community planning effort, which involved residents, police, and local agencies, culminated in the establishment of the COPS West facility. The residents of the West-Central neighborhood renovated a donated building, established a governing board, and kept the center open on a daily basis under the operation of community volunteers.

The NBS Program was established in 1993 with the placement of two CCOs housed at the COPS West facility. Subsequently, two CCOs were placed at each of four COPS Shops in the Spokane area. The sites are COPS NE (Northeast neighborhood in Spokane), COPS East Central (East Central neighborhood), and TOP COPS (located in downtown Spokane). COPS West is also the prototype for other operating or planned COPS Shops. In each case, local residents took a more active role in addressing and preventing crime within their communities.

Unique Character of the NBS Program

The NBS Program provides a new method for accomplishing the duties assigned to CCOs. While they continue to be responsible for supervising offenders, the definition of client broadens to include offenders, their families, and the neighborhood at large. Offenders are more “visible” under NBS and CCOs are familiar with their immediate environment. More direct contact between CCOs and offenders is the result, and CCOs feel they are able to respond more quickly and proactively with their clients. This aspect of community involvement has led to the CCOs handling adjusted caseloads to accommodate neighborhood interaction.

A unique element of this program is the increased involvement and coordination taking place at the local COPS Shops. Volunteers and local residents exchange offender-related information with the CCOs and are beginning to assist the offenders in holding them accountable for their behavior. Residents and businesses feel empowered as they experience more control within their neighborhoods. Evidence of enhanced safety and security includes a 35 percent reduction in burglaries in the West Central neighborhood since the beginning of COPS West and NBS.

NBS CCOs have helped implement several uniquely-tailored programs and services in specific communities. At one location, the CCOs assisted local hotel and motel managers in developing a notification system to inform one another of patrons who were conducting illegal activities within their establishments. Others are organizing meetings to help the community develop more diverse racial and ethnic representation at the COPS Shop. Another helped the local COPS Shop secure \$4,000 worth of radio dispatch equipment and portable radios. CCOs have developed various programs: one deals with the emergence of local street gangs, and another uses ex-offenders to conduct educational presentations with local youth. Currently in the downtown area, the COPS Shops, neighbors, businesses, and NBS CCOs are renovating buildings, installing security cameras, and improving lighting with the intention of moving illegal activity out of the area.

With each passing month, the Department of Corrections’ partnership with the community is becoming more of a reality.

Considerations in Establishing NBS-type Programs

There are a number of different policy considerations when starting this type of program. Administrators must:

Allow CCOs the flexibility to develop programs that fit the particular needs of each neighborhood / community.

Be willing to meet the challenge of providing an atmosphere where CCOs are encouraged to be creative, and work with the community and other stakeholders in developing programs.

Be willing to allow CCOs the time to develop programs within the neighborhoods. This requires clari-

fication between caseload supervision (traditional caseload work) and community involvement (non-traditional). Examples include developing joint programs, attending community / board meetings, interactions with the community members, etc.

Be willing to delegate decision-making to the CCO level so staff are empowered and the community members can see that the agency is especially interested in working with them in a true partnership.

Provide technical and administrative support that the outstations need. This would include equipment / communications that are needed for the officers to perform their day-to-day work (computers, cell phones, printers, dictation equipment, vehicles, etc.).

Be selective in choosing staff to work in neighborhood partnerships. Staff need the skills to work independently in the community and with the shareholders. In addition, they should be individuals who welcome the challenge of devising new approaches to performing their duties and who are not fearful of doing things in a different manner from what has been done traditionally.

Neighborhood Based Supervision offers a window of opportunity for law enforcement, Department of Corrections, and the community to join forces in true partnerships. The ever present concerns of crime and community protection are issues that transcend simplistic solutions. We can ill afford to return to the days where isolation and fear polarize our citizens. Together we can cross the bridge where community really does mean all of us.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

NIDORF RETIRES



Barry J. Nidorf, Chief Probation Officer for Los Angeles County, California, retired February 28, 1997, following a distinguished community corrections career.

Nidorf, who earned a bachelor’s degree from the University of California at Los Angeles and a Master of Public Administration degree from the University of Southern California, joined the Los Angeles County Probation Department as a Probation Trainee in 1965. From his date of employment until 1974 he worked in various capacities as a Deputy Probation Officer in Field Services Division. From 1975 to 1983 he held a variety of management positions of increasing responsibility. In November 1983 he was appointed to the position of Chief

Deputy Probation Officer and assumed responsibility for all operational bureaus in the Department. In June 1984 the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors appointed Nidorf Chief Probation Officer of the nation’s largest probation department, a position he held until his retirement this year.

During his exemplary career, Nidorf has served as Chairman Pro Tem of the Los Angeles County Criminal Justice Coordinating Committee, Chair of the California Corrections Executives Council, President of the Los Angeles County Management Council, Executive Board member of the Chief Probation Officers of California, and has held membership in the California Probation, Parole, and Correctional Association.

His influence and leadership has not been limited to the State of California. He has served on the Board of Directors of the National Association of Probation Executives and the American Probation and Parole Association. He is also a member of the American Correctional Association. In addition, he was a founding member of the Urban Probation Chiefs Network.

In September 1990 Attorney General Richard Thornburgh appointed Nidorf as a member of the National Institute of Corrections Advisory Board. He was reappointed in 1994 by Attorney General Janet Reno and in November 1994 he was elected Chair.

Nidorf has provided training, consultation, and technical assistance to criminal justice professionals from Russia, Israel, and England. He is widely published in professional journals peculiar to the community corrections profession.

In 1989 he was recognized as the Chief Probation Officer of the Year in California and in 1991 the National Association of Probation Executives presented him with the Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year Award.

He has provided constant and enlightened leadership to the field of community corrections during a career spanning more than three decades.

Nidorf plans to remain active in retirement. Persons wishing to contact him may do so by writing him at 17250 Braxton Street, Granada Hills, California 91344.

EXECUTIVE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM FOR NEW PROBATION EXECUTIVES PROGRESSES

The creation of an Executive Development Program for newly appointed probation executives is beginning to take shape. This project, a joint initiative of the National Association of Probation Executives, the National Institute of Corrections, and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University, was the subject of a second focus group meeting held in Alexandria, Virginia, in late February 1997. An earlier meeting took place in Huntsville, Texas, in September 1996.

Participants in this second meeting included: **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.**, Deputy Commissioner of Probation for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Immediate Past President of NAPE; **Rick Faulkner** of the National Institute of Corrections; **Dan Richard Beto**, Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas and NAPE Secretary; **Robert L.**

Bingham, Probate Court Administrator and a NAPE Board Member; **Richard E. Wyatt**, Chief of the Division of Probation and Parole for the State of Nevada; **Michael K. Brown**, Director of Field Services for New Hampshire; **Robert J. Burns**, Probation Administrator for Monroe County in Rochester, New York; **Cherie Townsend**, Chief Juvenile Probation Officer in Phoenix, Arizona; **Keith A. Koennig**, Chief U.S. Probation Officer in Cleveland, Ohio; **George M. Walker**, Chief Probation Officer in Indianapolis, Indiana; and, **Bob Burns** of the National Academy of Corrections.

During this second meeting the participants reviewed the work of the first group, evaluated surveys conducted on behalf of the project, and identified major topics to be presented in the Executive Development Program. The group also discussed the importance of a survival guide, the possibility of developing a web page of resources, and methods of delivery. The next phase of the project will be devoted to curriculum development, identifying candidates for participation, and identifying potential faculty members. Assuming the project continues to progress, the first Executive Development Program could take place prior to October 1997.

In the next issue of *Executive Exchange* a more comprehensive report will be provided on this project.

HOLDEN RETIRES IN OREGON

M. Tamara Holden, Director of the Multnomah County Department of Community Corrections in Portland, Oregon, since June 1992, recently retired.

Holden, who earned a Bachelor of Arts degree in political science from the University of Denver and a Master of Public Administration degree from the University of Utah, began her criminal justice career in 1972 as an adult probation and parole agent with the Utah Department of Corrections. During her tenure in Utah, she held a variety of positions of increasing responsibility, including Deputy Director of Field Operations, Administrator of Residential Facilities, and Warden.

During her distinguished career, Holden held positions of leadership in a number of professional organizations. She served as Treasurer of the National Association of Probation Executives, President of the Western Correctional Association, Treasurer of the American Correctional Association, State Representative for the International Association of Residential and Community Alternatives, and President of the Utah Correctional Association. In addition, she has been active in the American Society for Public Administration, American Probation and Parole Association, Urban Chiefs Network, and the North American Association of Wardens and Superintendents.

Holden, who has devoted a quarter of a century to the criminal justice system, has received a number of awards during her career. In 1988 the Western Correctional Association recognized her with its President's Special Award and

in 1990 the Utah Women's Political Caucus presented her with the Susa Young Gates Award. The Utah Correctional Association recognized her with its President's Award in 1991, and in 1992 the Volunteers of America presented her with the Maud Booth Correctional Service Award. In 1995 Holden was the recipient of the Executive of the Year Award presented by Sam Houston State University and the National Association of Probation Executives.

Holden plans to remain active in the National Association of Probation Executives. She may be reached at 6805 SE Ash Street, Portland, Oregon 97215.

MASSACHUSETTS PROGRAM RECOGNIZED

Many jurisdictions around the country are developing Community Policing and Community Corrections Partnerships and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has set a rather fast pace with its curfew enforcement program of "Night Light." This program has been in the media spotlight for over a year and deservingly so, because the program has been largely responsible for a major reduction in homicides of youths between the ages of 14 and 24 years in the Boston area.

Commissioner of Probation **Donald Cochran** and his Deputy **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.**, have elevated media attention to probation to the highest levels with "Night Light," says **Rick Faulkner** with the National Institute of Corrections. Cochran and Corbett do not accept the laurels for this program; rather, they credit the officers in the streets for making a profound difference.

In 1996 U.S. Attorney General **Janet Reno** visited the program and in February 1997 President **Bill Clinton** observed the program firsthand. This program has been highlighted in *The Wall Street Journal*, *Christian Science Monitor*, *New York Times*, *Community Policing Exchange*, *Boston Globe*, and news programs of NBC-TV, CBS-TV, NPR, and MTV.

Not only do the Boston probation officers do a good job on the streets, they also do a good job of communicating a successful program in the media.

NAPE MEMBERS PARTICIPATE IN PROBATION THINK TANK

On March 11, 1997, the Manhattan Institute in New York City hosted a meeting to discuss "best practices" in the field of probation and how to trigger and advance probation "re-invention" efforts in mid-size and large cities. This meeting was called by **John J. DiIulio, Jr.**, Professor of Politics and Public Affairs at Princeton University, and was held under the auspices of the Center for Civic Innovation of the Manhattan Institute.

NAPE members participating in this strategy session included: **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.**, Deputy Commissioner of Probation for Massachusetts and NAPE Immediate Past President; **Dan Richard Beto**, Director of the Correctional Management Institute of Texas and NAPE Secretary; **Richard A. Kipp**, Chief Probation Officer for Lehigh County, Pennsyl-

vania, and NAPE Treasurer; and **Rocco Pozzi**, Commissioner of Probation in Westchester County, New York, a NAPE Member, and President of the American Probation and Parole Association.

Others attending included **Larry Anderson**, Division Director of the Georgia Department of Community Corrections; **Todd Clear** of Florida State University; **David Kennedy** of Harvard University; **Michael J. Cleary**, Assistant District Attorney in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; and, **Ed Rhine**, Deputy Director of the Ohio Department of Youth Services.

NEW MEMBERS

Since the publication of the last issue of *Executive Exchange*, three probation executives have joined the Association; they are as follows:

Morris E. Easley, Jr., Director of the Division of Probation and Parole, Louisiana Department of Public Safety and Corrections, P.O. Box 94304, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804.

Diane L. McGinnis, Director of Adult Probation for the Superior Court of Pima County, 110 West Congress, 8th Floor, Tucson, Arizona 85701.

James F. Wichtman, Director of the Northwest County Community Corrections Center for Wood County, 203 North Prospect Street, Bowling Green, Ohio 43402.

PREVENTION YELLOW PAGES IN TEXAS RECEIVES RECOGNITION

The *Prevention Yellow Pages*, developed and maintained by the Texas Youth Commission (TYC) in Austin, Texas, is the largest on-line directory of programs, resources, references, and research on all aspects of the development and care of children, youth, and family. Persons with access to the Internet can find the website at <www.tyc.state.tx.us/prevention/40001ref.html>. Many of the articles listed are in portable document format (pdf) and can be read and printed using a free Adobe Acrobat Reader. The *Prevention Yellow Pages* is an ongoing initiative of the Texas Youth Commission and new material is added on a regular basis.

In November 1996 the *Prevention Yellow Pages* was awarded a two-star rating on the Mental Health Net, the largest catalog of mental health, psychology, and psychiatry resources online today.

In January 1997 the *Prevention Yellow Pages* was selected as one of 20 educational websites to receive the honor of "Best of January" given by *Education World*. In addition, the Blue Web'n Learning Applications Library gave four stars to the *Prevention Yellow Pages*. This honor is reserved for the best instructional lessons, activities, projects, resources, references, and tools on the web.

Also in January 1997 INFOSEEK (one of the busiest sites on the Internet, receiving over 25 million requests per day and winner of the *PC Magazine* Most Valuable Product Award in

the Category of Best Internet Tool) listed the *Prevention Yellow Pages* website in "first place" among 84,647 websites on the topic of "prevention." In third place was the home page of the National Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in Atlanta. For comparison, among the 84,647 prevention websites found, this top rated search site also listed the National Crime Prevention Council (25th place), National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information (60th place), National Clearinghouse on Child Abuse and Neglect (111th place), Canadian Crime Prevention Center (141st place), National Institute of Health (227th place), and the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (247th place).

As of January 17, 1997, all 50 states and 43 foreign countries had downloaded information from the TYC *Prevention Yellow Pages*. The most popular subjects include gangs, delinquency, health, abuse, parenting, adolescence, and violence.

BOSTON 1997

The next meeting of the National Association of Probation Executives will be held in Boston, Massachusetts, in conjunction with the 22nd Annual APPA Training Institute.

On the evening of Saturday, August 16, 1997, the Association will host a reception at the Sheraton Boston Hotel and Towers and on Sunday, August 17, 1997, the Annual Awards Breakfast will be held at the Colonnade Hotel.

NAPE members are encouraged to make their reservations at the Colonnade Hotel, which is located at 120 Huntington Avenue in Boston across the street from the Sheraton and the Hynes Convention Center. The Colonnade, a member of the Summit International Hotels and the Concorde Group, may be contacted by calling (617) 424-7000 or the toll free number (800) 962-3030. When making reservations, identify yourself as attending the American Probation and Parole Association Annual Institute; a block of rooms has been reserved.

INTERSTATE COMPACT MANUAL REVISED

The *Interstate Compact Manual*, produced by the Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association, has undergone significant revision. New copies may be purchased for \$50.00 by contacting **Raymond Parra** or **Larry Hermance** at the Texas Interstate compact Office at (512) 491-7420. Written requests may be sent to the following address:

Raymond Parra, Treasurer
Parole and Probation Compact Administrators' Association
ATTN: PPCAA Manual
9800 North Lamar, Suite 110
Austin, Texas 78753

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES

Who We Are

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

What We Do

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

Types of Membership

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

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

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

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

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

Why Join

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

Membership Application (TAX # 58-1497263)

NAME _____ TITLE _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE # _____ FAX # _____ DATE OF APPLICATION _____

CHECK

Regular

☐ \$ 50 / 1 yea

☐ \$ 95 / 2 years

☐ \$140 / 3 years

Organizational

☐ \$250 / 1 year

Corporate

☐ \$500 / 1 year

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

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