

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

WINTER 1998

GUEST EDITOR'S MESSAGE

Community corrections practitioners from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania have contributed several articles to this issue of *Executive Exchange* which should be of interest to probation executives.

John J. Sikora, Chief Probation Officer for Lehigh County, has written an interesting article on formulating justice policy in which he commends a restorative approach. His article is followed by a contribution by Jefferson County Chief Adult Probation Officer Larry Straitiff, who traces the development of firearms training for probation and parole officers in Pennsylvania.

Also highlighted are several Pennsylvania programs: Jeanne M. Specht discusses the Parole Re-Entry Program; Mary Achilles provides an overview of a domestic violence initiative; Paul W. Ward describes the value of a school-based

program for youthful offenders; Thomas N. Costa outlines Philadelphia's efforts at dealing with welfare fraud; and Christopher Pandolfo and Patricia Azzara summarize an innovative strategy to deal with the issue of substance abuse.



We hope you find these brief articles interesting and thought-provoking. Should you require additional information about any of the program described in this issue, please do not hesitate to contact the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole or specific contact persons identified in the articles.

W. Conway Bushey
Board Secretary
Board of Probation and Parole
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

CONTENTS

Guest Editors's Message, <i>W. Conway Bushey</i>	1
Formulating Justice Policy: A Restorative Approach, <i>John J. Sikora</i>	2
The Development of Standardized Firearms Training in Pennsylvania, <i>Larry Straitiff</i>	3
The Parole Re-Entry Program, <i>Jeanne M. Specht</i>	4
Pennsylvania's Response to Domestic Violence, <i>Mary Achilles</i>	5
School-based Probation: A New Way of Doing Business, <i>Paul W. Ward</i>	6
Welfare Fraud: A Serious Approach, <i>Thomas N. Costa</i>	7
Substance Abuse Violator Effort, <i>Christopher Pandolfo and Patricia Azzara</i>	8
News From the Field	10

FORMULATING JUSTICE POLICY: A RESTORATIVE APPROACH

by
John J. Sikora
Chief Adult Probation Officer
Lehigh County Adult Probation Department
Allentown, Pennsylvania

The criminal justice system as a whole, and probation and parole systems in general, have continually been challenged by the unresolved issues of punishment, rehabilitation, and protection of the community. Many departments, responding to public and political criticism, and faced with limited resources, have been forced to respond with an impersonal, surveillance-oriented approach to the supervision services provided. Successes on probation and parole are thus measured in terms of reaching a maximum date without reoffending, or simply attending a prescribed treatment program with little or no regard for goals and objectives achieved.

In March 1996, the Lehigh County Adult Probation Department, under the direction of former Chief Richard A. Kipp, decided to adopt what was viewed at the time as a more personal approach to the aforementioned issues. A model of *Restorative Justice* was implemented and has remained in operation eighteen months later. The paradigm seeks to restore the offender, the community, and the victim as active participants in the criminal justice system (Zehr, 1989). In this approach, the central theme revolves around the development of competencies and accountability within individual offenders. Activities are designed to address factors identified as contributing to the offender's criminal actions, are therapeutic and educational, and are measured in terms of the offender's acquisition and development of skills (P.C.C.D., 1995).

While the department still provides restrictive programming for offenders who present moderate to high risk to reoffend, i.e. Intensive Drug Supervision, Electronic Monitoring, and specialized programs for offenders suffering with mental illness and/or mental retardation, the adoption of the *Restorative Justice Model* in Lehigh County led to the development of several innovative projects which seek to address those factors believed to be contributors to the likelihood of an offender's continued criminal behavior. A discussion of the major components of the model in Lehigh County follows.

Adult Literacy Project

Referral, testing, and educational instruction are provided to offenders in an on-site computer lab by a trained employee designated as a part-time probation aide. Probationers submit to screening and testing prior to their admission, then are able to advance at their own pace with the instructor's motivation and guidance. The personalized curriculum is based on the pre-testing of life skills, pre-GED, and GED needs of individual offenders. Classes are scheduled three times per week and have been expanded to include two evening sessions to accommodate probationers' demands and schedules.

While the ultimate goal of the program is to enable offenders to obtain a General Equivalency Diploma, successes are

also based on grade level improvement in the following areas: vocabulary, reading comprehension, spelling, language, number operations, and problem-solving. In the past year, students averaged level improvements of 3.2 grades for vocabulary, 2.4 for reading comprehension, 2.2 for spelling, 3.9 for language, 5.5 for number operations, and 4.4 for problem-solving. A total of 30 students obtained their General Equivalency Diploma.

Alcohol Highway Safety Project

This program involves pre-testing and evaluation of driving under the influence (DUI) offenders via the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation's Court Reporting Network, referrals to counseling and treatment agencies, and instruction of the Adult Probation Department's Safe-Driving School by probation officers. During 1996, a total of 958 Court Reporting Network evaluations were completed by probation staff, which led to 830 offenders successfully completing the Safe-Driving School.

Finance

This is a joint effort of the Adult Probation Department, the Consumer Credit Counseling Service of Lehigh Valley, and the Pennsylvania Department of Public Assistance, which, as a team, test knowledge of entry level offenders in such areas as budgeting, checking accounts, and welfare reform. Weekly classes with 15 to 20 offenders per session are instructed in the tested areas. Post-tests are administered to determine skill and knowledge acquisition. The past year saw 288 offenders successfully complete classes by showing improved pre-test scores.

Health Issues

A cooperative effort continues to exist between the Adult Probation Department and the Allentown Health Bureau. Various educational programs are presented in weekly classes, including: Tuberculosis, HIV Education, Universal Precautions/Hepatitis, First Aid and Safety, Heart Disease, and Sexually Transmitted Diseases. In 1996, a total of 468 offenders completed instruction.

Job Readiness Training

Probation officers, specializing and trained in employment issues, teach unemployed and unskilled offenders in job searches, filling out applications, interviewing, and training recruitment. Completion of these three-a-week sessions is determined by successful job acquisition, placement in an ancillary job training program, or for those who chose not to attend and cooperate, violation. Nearly 1,000 offenders completed these sessions in the past year, 88% of whom chose the successful route.

Substance Abuse, Assessment, Education, and Counseling

This is another collaborative effort begun by the Adult Probation Department, this time with the local Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse. In this project, evaluations and group counseling are provided on-site by a contracted-for employee to substance using and abusing offenders. Sessions are scheduled at all hours of the day based on offender needs and are conducted in the Adult Probation Department's own conference facilities.

Summary

The Lehigh County Adult Probation Department has been fortunate to obtain financial assistance for staffing these programs and for equipment from Pennsylvania's Commission on Crime and Delinquency, an organization committed to the improvement of offender services through progressive and innovative intermediate punishment programming. Through that type of support, other programs in their initial stages are a parenting skills program, programs dealing with prevention of domestic violence and child abuse, and victim/offender mediation.

The on-site classroom approach has enabled probation officers to impact on large numbers of offenders, certainly a requirement in conditions where fiscal management is of great concern. Resources can thus be more effectively and efficiently applied to those areas and offenders in need of more intensive services, and enable probation officers to fulfill their ultimate mission — protection of the community.

References

P.A.C.T. Institute of Justice. *Crime Hurts . . . Justice Heals*. Menonite Central Committee, United States Office of Criminal Justice, 1990.

Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency. *Intermediate Punishment Programs Conference Booklet*. State College, Pennsylvania, 1995.

Zehr, Howard. "Justice: Stumbling Toward a Restorative Ideal," *New Perspectives on Crime and Justice*, No. 7, 1989.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF STANDARDIZED FIREARMS TRAINING IN PENNSYLVANIA

by
Larry Straitiff
Chief Adult Probation Officer
Jefferson County
Brookville, Pennsylvania

The approval of Act 158 of 1994 by Governor Robert Casey on December 27, 1994, created the County Probation and Parole Officers' Firearm Education and Training Commission. Act 158 was passed to bring to county probation in Pennsylvania a uniform and standardized firearms training program for officers who have been authorized to carry firearms in conjunction with their employment as adult or juvenile probation officers serving the State's Courts of Common Pleas. The act also sought to improve public and officer safety and to reduce potential liabilities to the counties via effective firearms training.

Prior to Act 158, counties that authorized their probation and parole officers to carry firearms utilized a wide variety of training programs. Some county probation departments required their officers to attend the firearms training portion of the Municipal Police Officers' Basic Training (Act 120) or

the Pennsylvania Lethal Weapons Training Program for private security officers (Act 235). In addition, several county probation departments developed high quality in-house training programs and some of those programs exceeded generally accepted standards for police firearms training in Pennsylvania. However, some county probation departments provided little or no training to their officers who were authorized to carry a duty firearm.

The Commission is charged with, among other duties, the following primary responsibilities:

- 1) To develop uniform statewide minimum standards for training and competency of county probation officers in relation to firearm education and training, including an initial or basic training curriculum of at least 40 hours of instruction;
- 2) To certify and/or revoke the certification of county probation officers in relation to the act;
- 3) To consider establishing policy and procedures for waiving the Basic Training Course requirement for those officers which had already completed equivalent training programs;
- 4) To establish minimum qualifications for and approve or revoke the approval of instructors and schools which provide firearms education and training under Act 158; and
- 5) To develop ongoing in-service firearms training programs for county probation officers which go beyond the initial basic training course.

The Commission is comprised of nine members appointed by the Governor representing the various sectors of county and state government bodies which are most concerned with the effective operation of the county adult and juvenile probation systems in Pennsylvania. Governor Tom Ridge appointed the first seven Commission members in December 1995 and the remaining two Commissioners in January and March 1996. The Commission met for the first time on January, 30 1996.

The Commission's first order of business was to conduct a survey of the probation departments in the state to determine:

- 1) How many officers were carrying firearms and from what regions of the state; and
- 2) How many additional officers were likely to be permitted to carry firearms as a result of the training which the Commission would be providing.

The results of this survey revealed that nearly 700 officers were either currently carrying or anticipated doing so within the next 18 months. This initial survey provided the Commission with a framework for working on the tasks ahead.

The Commission then set about collecting information from as many existing law enforcement firearms training programs as possible in an attempt to avoid duplicating their efforts and to assist with the development of the basic training course curriculum. To that end training materials were reviewed from many agencies including:

- 1) Pennsylvania Municipal Police Officers' Training and Education Commission;
- 2) Pennsylvania Deputy Sheriffs' Training Commission;
- 3) Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole;
- 4) United States Probation Service;
- 5) California Probation Commission;
- 6) Pennsylvania State Police;
- 7) Pennsylvania Constables' Training Commission; and
- 8) Federal Bureau of Investigation.

The Commission also obtained legal opinions from the Chief Counsel’s Office in the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole (PBPP) regarding the authority of probation officers in relation to carrying firearms. This information was used to assist in developing the Commission’s firearms program and to ensure the Commission was in compliance with existing statutes and case law.

In October of 1996 the Commission hired an Executive Director. It is his responsibility, among other duties, to provide a day to day presence for the Commission at offices provided by the PBPP in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. The Executive Director was quickly pressed into action assisting the Commission with finalizing the curriculum, scheduling the various testing and training efforts, processing the applications for waivers and basic training and establishing a records keeping system.

Since the Commission had limited resources, most of the work dealing with program development had to be completed by Commissioner members who were serving on various committees. In the spring of 1997, the Commission developed a tentative curriculum for the Basic Firearms Training Course, including the instructors’ manual, student workbooks, video training tapes, the qualification course of fire, written tests, and the waiver study guide. In addition, the Commission adopted a one time waiver policy for the county probation officers who are authorized by their county to carry firearms.

The Commission is supported financially by a \$5.00 per docket number cost assessed to all adult criminal offenders in Pennsylvania. These funds are transmitted by the County Clerk of Courts to the Pennsylvania Department of Revenue. Initially, the collection of these fees was sporadic and slow. Currently the Commission appears to be receiving sufficient funding to accomplish its mission. Based on current revenues, the Commission adopted a policy to provide all classroom training at no cost to the participating counties and reimburse the counties the cost of lodging for county officers attending training sessions. In addition, the cost for the ammunition used by the officers taking the waiver range exams or the basic training course will be reimbursed by the Commission.

Currently 88 county probation officers have submitted applications to take the Basic Firearms Training Course. The Commission has conducted three Basic Firearms Training Courses since April of 1997 and plans to conduct a fourth training session in the spring of 1998. A total of 75 county officers have taken the basic training and 70 of those officers have successfully completed the training and have been certified by the Commission to carry firearms. The Commission has also given written wavier exams in nine counties throughout the Commonwealth for the 315 officers who met specific eligibility requirements. The waiver range exams are expected to be completed by the end of October 1998. All officers who successfully pass both the waiver written and range exams will be certified by the Commission to carry firearms. The Commission is also in the process of developing a Continuing Education Program for all officers that have been certified by the Commission to carry firearms.

In summary, the County Probation and Parole Officers’ Education and Training Commission was created to improve the professionalism of the many firearm carrying officers in Pennsylvania and thereby improving the safety and well-being of the citizens of the Commonwealth. The Commission has taken significant steps to bring this goal to fruition. The Commission

members have given many hours of their time and expertise to develop a Firearms Education and Training Program for Pennsylvania’s county probation officers, which is second to none.

The Commission also would like to acknowledge the support given to them by the PBPP, without which the Commission would not have been able to achieve the goals that were established. Finally, the Commission acknowledges the assistance of the Governor’s Office and the legislative sponsor of Act 158, Senator Robert D. Robbins.

All Commission inquiries may be directed to Mr. Chester A. Kope, Executive Director at 3101 North Front Street, P.O. Box 1661, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105.

THE PAROLE RE-ENTRY PROGRAM

by
Jeanne M. Specht
PREP Unit
Board of Probation and Parole
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

The Parole RE-Entry Program (PREP) on Seventh Street in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, has two goals: protection of the community and reintegration of paroled offenders into the community. As a special unit in the Harrisburg District Office of the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole, the PREP Unit’s staff works hard to respect, direct, and monitor parolees under its supervision. We are driven to change negative behaviors. Criminal behavior grows out of some physical, emotional, or social problem of the individual offender.

This unit functions as a day reporting center to which recently released parolees report daily, Monday through Friday. When they obtain employment, they are required to call in daily, report one or two times per week to submit urine for analysis, and are seen at home by their agent. They are placed on electronic monitoring for the first month, urine is taken at least once a week, and all are required to attend parole orientation, AIDS class, and job groups. The local NA and AA chapters are helpful in providing dedicated members to run closed meetings for parolees on Monday and Wednesday nights. In addition, Bob Gingrich of Gingrich Associates conducts three sex offender groups for state parolees and Dauphin County probation sex offenders on-site Tuesdays, since this type of counseling is elsewhere unavailable in Dauphin County for indigent offenders.

The goal of this unit is to not only monitor behavior but to form a support system for the parolee. At no other time is life more difficult for the offender than the first several months after release. Imagine an adult offender released from prison after five years of confinement to a home with a mother, no job, no money, and many bills (fines, costs, restitution, child support, and supervision fees). Additionally, most of the offenders also possess a drug or alcohol addiction, no positive associates, no employment history, no skills, and low self-esteem. The portrait of an average parolee obviously suggests failure is a real

possibility. In order to assist these offenders in becoming productive members of society, they need to value work, family, a higher power, freedom, and positive behaviors. Each staff member is a concerned, dedicated, professional and shares the responsibility of supervising each offender. The unit must work as a team to function appropriately.

Most parolees graduate from this program to be supervised by the general city unit when they display stability. Being “stable” means having a solid home and job, staying clean and sober, attending drug/alcohol counseling, abiding by curfew regulations, and presenting no eminent threat to the community. Those who do not follow the parole conditions are sanctioned accordingly and returned to jail when the risk warrants that action.

Currently, we supervise sex offenders for six months and transfer them when stability is unquestioned. The majority of the other parolees are held within this unit from 45-60 days. We are not certain of the statistical effects of this unit as no statistics are officially kept. However, it is obvious to us that within the parameter of the one and one-half years of our existence, we have rarely received persons reparoled to our program (after their parole was revoked) who had successfully completed our program. Most of the reparole cases we currently receive, who have served 3-18 months back time, have not previously completed our program. If someone is destined to fail, they seem to do so in the first six months and usually do not make it out of our program before they are sanctioned through inpatient treatment, half-way back status, or incarceration.

The community has opened its arms to the program and we have developed liaisons within the AIDS and NA/AA communities. We owe our success to expecting change and rejecting failure. Close monitoring of parolees elicits behavioral change and quickly uncovers substance abuse, curfew violations, and other unacceptable practices. Immediate action redirects these problem behaviors to avoid further criminal activity and risk to the community.

PENNSYLVANIA’S RESPONSE TO DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

by
Mary Achilles
Victim Advocate
Board of Probation and Parole
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

The supervision of domestic violence offenders is a challenge for probation and parole agents. Agents have often viewed domestic violence offenders as difficult to identify and the victims of these crimes as uncooperative. These issues pose a great challenge for agents, particularly in a criminal justice system that has historically minimized domestic violence. In an effort to effectively address these and other issues around domestic violence, the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole, the Office of the Victim Advocate, and the Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence have joined forces in Pennsylvania to develop an institutionalized response within the Board of

Probation and Parole to domestic violence, the offenders, and their victims.

Since domestic violence has been identified as an area of concern within the population that the Board supervises, an effort that would institutionalize an appropriate response was sought. A grant through the Commission on Crime and Delinquency has enabled the Board of Probation and Parole to contract with the Domestic Violence Coalition to develop a *model protocol for the supervision of domestic violence offenders* along with a *training curriculum* that will become part of our basic training academy. This two year project started with the development of a project advisory committee consisting of parole staff, both senior management and line staff, in addition to domestic violence victim advocates and batter intervention experts to guide the development of this project.

The first year of the project consisted of the development of the project materials (protocol and training curriculum). The protocol for the supervision of domestic violence offenders will address the issues of identification of domestic violence offenders, the coordination with local county efforts in the prevention and intervention in domestic violence, and the effective sanctioning of domestic violence offenders under the supervision of the Board of Probation and Parole.

Because the Board of Probation and Parole supervises over 22,000 state-sentenced offenders, this population is quite different from those that we find at the county level. These individuals have all been sentenced to lengthy prison sentences and have a significant violent background. One of the great challenges to this project has simply been the identification of domestic violence offenders.

The project advisory group has identified two distinct populations of domestic violence offenders: 1) those that were convicted of a crime of violence stemming from a domestic violence situation; and 2) those that engage in domestic violence with partners once under supervision. This calls for two significant points of identification, the first prior to release and the later once under supervision.

The protocol will define appropriate intervention with the offender including an enhanced level of supervision and also the identification of services available to the victim. The protocol will also contain a proactive approach towards victims by including in all home plan investigations a tool for agents to utilize when interviewing prospective residence that will assist in identify a past history of domestic violence and promote victim safety by providing information on local services for domestic violence victims and the Boards’ policy on domestic violence.

The second year of the project will include the implementation of the protocol along with the training of trainers for parole staff and the reeducation and training of all existing agency staff. Once this is completed in 1998, the two day training will become part of our basic training academy in January of 1999. The agency will have 30 staff members who will act as skill bank trainers for future training academies and the Domestic Violence Coalition will provide technical assistance during the second year of the project.

For additional information on this project, contact the Office of the Victim Advocate at (717) 783-8185.

SCHOOL-BASED PROBATION: A NEW WAY OF DOING BUSINESS

by
Paul W. Ward
Juvenile Court Judges' Commission
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania

Historically, the relationship between schools and juvenile probation departments in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania could be, at best, characterized as one of dynamic tension. While probation officers did their best to maintain a youth in the community, which included advocating for and obtaining credible education services, school personnel were not always pleased when confronted with probation clients that, in most cases, were not viewed as the "best" students in either the academic or behavioral sense of the word.

From this writer's point of view, a change in the traditional relationship between these two organizations began to occur as a result of two seemingly unrelated events. In December of 1990, based upon a pilot project initiated in 1985, Act 211 was passed which required that: "By June 1, 1991, the Secretary of Education shall recommend to the General Assembly a plan to require and assist each school district to establish and maintain a program to provide appropriate counseling and support services to students who experience problems related to the use of drugs, alcohol and dangerous controlled substances." The program selected to fulfill this requirement was the Student Assistance Program (SAP). Since its inception, SAP has expanded the areas of concern to include mental health. In essence, the implementation of SAP created a pro-active method of providing services to children experiencing problems within the school environment and opened schools to collaboration with outside social services agencies.

The other event occurred in August 1990 when the Juvenile Court Judges' Commission (JCJC) provided funding to the Lehigh County Probation Department to implement a demonstration project that placed probation officers on a full-time basis in a middle school of the Allentown School District. The stimulus for the development of this program was the realization by the two organizations that, while they were often providing services to the same individuals, they were frequently not working in concert, which diminished their ability to intervene in the lives of their mutual clientele.

In this new configuration, the school-based probation concept was viewed as a partnership designed to: a) increase communication between the school district and probation department; b) increase coordination among the family, school, probation department and appropriate community agencies; c) meet the educational and related needs of mutual clients; and d) provide schools with alternatives for managing students exhibiting behavioral problems.

In assessing program outcomes, Lehigh County staff compared pre-program versus post-program statistics in regard to school-based probation clients and reported the following results for the first year of operation:

Detention/suspension	-4.0%
Tardiness	-9.5%
Absenteeism	-15.0%

Improvement in Grades
Dropouts

+4.1%
-29.0%

Based upon the success of the demonstration project, the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency (PCCD) began to fund additional programs in February 1993. To date, the PCCD has awarded over five million dollars to implement 43 School-based Probation Projects. The programs are operating in 43 counties and are providing services to approximately 4,500 clients per year in 147 of the 501 school districts in the Commonwealth.

Over time, the goals and objectives of the school-based concept were refined, and the current goals are to increase the probability that individuals provided with school-based probation services will function successfully in the school environment and reduce their delinquent behavior. These goals are translated into measurable objectives which included many of the original objectives of the Lehigh County project.

- * Decreasing school disciplinary referrals.
- * Decreasing the number of days and the frequency of detention and suspensions.
- * Decreasing absenteeism.
- * Increasing the number of positive school reports as evidenced by teacher comments, and ultimately improvement in grade point average.
- * Decreasing the drop-out rate.
- * Reducing recidivism (defined as re-arrest or a new juvenile court referral).
- * Reducing the number of clients going into out-of-home placements as a result of delinquent behavior.

In February 1995, a School-based Probation Advisory Committee was formed to explore ways to improve and/or modify the existing concept, to identify specialized training needs, and to develop a manual of guidelines to help practitioners implement and maintain a school-base probation program. The committee is composed of chief juvenile probation officers, supervisors of school-based probation officers, school-based probation officers, school principals and vice principals, a representative from the Pennsylvania Department of Education, and representatives from PCCD and JCJC.

The committee has completed the manual which was published in April 1996, and a copy of the booklet was sent to each school-based probation officer and school principal involved with these programs. One of the most helpful components of this document is a clear and concise mission statement and a clarification of the role of school-based probation officers. For example, the mission statement asserts that "a school-based probation officer is a juvenile probation officer with a school as his/her primary work site, whose authority is governed by the Juvenile Act and relevant school policies. The school-based probation officer delivers service using the concept of the 'balanced approach' to ensure community protection and public safety, client accountability, and the development of client competencies. To that end, the school-based probation officer provides on-site supervision and immediate intervention to students under court jurisdiction by coordinating services with the school, community and family. In conjunction with school personnel, these specialized probation officers promote a drug free, safe environment in which to improve the academic and behavioral performance of their clients."

Obviously, school-based probation has exploded across the Commonwealth in a relatively short period of time. Both school district administrators and probation staff "feel" very good about their programs. Seasoned chief juvenile probation officers, who are not easily impressed, feel that this is the most effective system change they have witnessed during their professional careers. Although the school-based probation programs have enjoyed overwhelming acceptance, there are areas of concern. The probation officers providing school-based probation services have often experienced role confusion. For example, the officers are pressured to deal with any issue or problem that develops with a client in the school setting in lieu of any involvement by a school official and/or teacher. The second area of concern is related to the first. As the officers' credibility grows in regard to their ability to deal effectively with difficult to manage youth, they are pressured to become disciplinarians for the general population of students. These situations led to the development of the guidelines regarding the role of school-based probation officers. The aforementioned manual contains 36 descriptive phrases that delineate the "dos and don'ts" of a school-based probation officer.

At this point, the major concern with the school-based probation concept is the lack of an in-depth and independent evaluation to determine what, if any, measurable impacts can be attributed to these programs. In an effort to remedy this situation, the Pennsylvania Commission on Crime and Delinquency awarded a grant to the Pennsylvania Council of Chief Juvenile Probation Officers to contract with a highly qualified and independent researcher to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of school-based probation programs in the Commonwealth. In collaboration with the Center for Juvenile Justice Training and Research at Shippensburg University, the council selected Dave Metzger, Ph.D. from the University of Pennsylvania as the principal investigator. The evaluation was initiated in January 1996 and results extracted from the executive summary of the final draft of the evaluation report are as follows.

- * Cases assigned to School-based Probation (SBP) are demographically very similar to those assigned to more traditional forms of supervision SBP cases were younger and somewhat more likely to be female. There were no differences in the racial distribution between SBP and non-SBP cases.
- * The types of index charges of the SBP cases do not differ from those of cases assigned to other forms of probation supervision.
- * Among SBP officers the median percent of time spent in the school environment was 70%. There was a significant association between the amount of time spent in the school environment and the amount of direct case contact.
- * SBP officers, school personnel and SBP clients have high regard for the program and feel that it is effective in increasing school attendance, academic performance, and improving behavior in and out of the school environment.
- * While the majority of SBP officers viewed their role as insuring the delivery of needed services to their assigned cases, they perceived others to view their primary role as law enforcement for the student body.

The case-control study found that school-based probation cases had significantly more time in the community without criminal charges and placements. These cases were significantly less likely to be charged with serious new crimes. Consistent with closer supervision, school-based probation cases were significantly more likely to be charged with probation violations

and status offenses. In addition, these cases had significantly fewer days in placement. Placement cost savings are projected to average \$6,665 for every case assigned to school-based probation programs.

In summary, the initial findings of the study conducted by Dr. Metzger appear to indicate some significant positive outcomes associated with school-based probation services. However, Dr. Metzger cautions the reader about the limited scope of this study and plans to seek additional funding to conduct a more comprehensive examination of school-based probation. Finally, it is this writer's opinion that school-based probation has already significantly changed the face of juvenile probation in the Commonwealth. It is too late to turn back. A majority of the juvenile probation departments have embraced the concept, and there are very few reports by juvenile probation departments or school districts that suggest an unhappiness with the partnership. Regardless of the findings of empirical studies, this concept has struck a responsive chord. The concept appears to be wrapped in the furls of intuitive thinking. In essence, there seems to be a strong perception that it works; therefore it does. Given the momentum that has been established, it is highly unlikely that the concept will wither. Indeed, it is more likely that school-based probation will become a prototype for collaborative efforts at all levels among social service delivery systems.

WELFARE FRAUD: A SERIOUS APPROACH

by
Thomas N. Costa
Supervisor, Fraud Unit
Adult Probation and Parole Department
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Under 62 Pa. C.S. § 481 the Philadelphia District Attorney's Office has the legislative power it needs to attack the welfare fraud problem. Over the years more than 6,000 cases have been prosecuted, with millions of dollars ordered in restitution to be paid back to the Commonwealth for monies, food stamps, or medical assistance benefits fraudulently received.

This statute also provides for the continued collection of restitution past the maximum term of imprisonment to which the offender could have been sentenced on this crime. Restitution is mandatory in welfare fraud cases and the court has the statutory authority to order payments beyond the probationary term. A violation of probation hearing is scheduled when the probationer has not made a bona fide effort to pay restitution. Thus the sentencing court shall retain jurisdiction in this matter until the restitution is paid in full.

With the prosecution of these cases, the burden shifted to the Philadelphia Adult Probation and Parole Department (PAPD) for supervision and collection. Presently the PAPD supervises over 4,000 minimum supervision cases.

Over the years a close working relationship has developed between the District Attorney's Office Economic Crimes Unit/Government Fraud Unit (ECU/GFU), the Office of Inspector

General (OIG), and the PAPD Fraud Unit. Information regarding identification and clarification of court orders is shared freely among all three agencies. Between the ECU/GFU and the Fraud Unit information is shared regarding probation violation hearings; this guarantees continuity in the prosecution of these cases.

With Act 35 of the 1996 Session the Public Welfare Code was amended; it enables the Fraud Unit to inform the OIG that certain probationers have active warrants are not in compliance with their probation and may be ineligible for assistance under this Act.

Through the collection efforts of the Fraud Unit in 1996, \$1,098,817.47 was returned to the Department of Public Welfare. Since the creation of the specialized Fraud Unit within the PAPD in 1986, \$8,287,623.67 in restitution has been collected.

Probation Department Supervision

All probationers assigned to the Fraud Unit have an initial interview conducted and sign the PAPD rules and regulations. The initial interview focuses on the probationer’s current financial situation; also they must provide three collateral contact persons not residing with them. The probationers are also provided payment instructions and given an appointment date to return with the first payment. Subsequent payments will be mailed into the Probation Department’s Accounting Unit by the probationer on a monthly basis. All probationers start out on minimum supervision with mail in payments and monthly phone calls. Their compliance with the monthly payments and phone calls play an important part in their remaining on minimum supervision. Review of their compliance is conducted regularly through case conferences.

In general, when a probationer falls behind in his /her restitution payment schedule, a varying degree of action is taken by the Fraud Unit staff:

- A) One month behind: no action is taken against the probationer because of the time delay in mailing, and processing.
- B) Two and three months behind: a delinquency letter is sent informing the probationer that they should bring the account up to date.
- C) Four and five months behind: a letter which is referred to as a “DA Letter” is sent to the probationer. This letter is a little more forceful in the actions that will take place if the probationer does not comply.
- D) Six and seven months behind: a contact letter is sent to the probationer to report to our office in person. At that time a payment plan is set up in order for the probationer to catch up on payments.
- E) Eight or more months behind: a violation of probation summary is prepared and the probationer is sent a copy of this summary with notice to report in person to our office to sign service for the violation hearing.
- F) If contact can not be established with the probationer then an investigation would be conducted regarding the whereabouts of the probationer. The probation officer uses the contact people listed in the initial interview, as supplied by the probationer. A check with the OIG would also be done for any information that could be used to locate the probationer. A violation hearing is then listed and a warrant is requested if the probationer cannot be located.

In 1995 a computerized database letter program was developed, enabling each officer to send a multitude of various let-

ters to probationers. This program also assists the officer in reviewing every case on a monthly basis.

Insurance Fraud

Another initiative of the Fraud Unit involves insurance fraud cases.

Act 166 of 1994: “Providing for Insurance fraud prevention; establishing the Insurance Fraud Prevention Authority and providing for its powers and duties; establishing the Insurance Fraud Prevention Trust Fund; establishing a section for investigation and prosecution within the Office of Attorney General and providing for its powers and duties; and providing for funding of insurance fraud investigation and prosecution in county district attorneys’ offices, for confidentiality and for certain immunities.”

Because of the Fraud Unit’s success in the collection of restitution, the District Attorney’s Office has requested that the supervision of insurance fraud cases be placed under realm of the Fraud Unit.

In 1996, 39 cases were received and \$49,688.08 was collected in restitution by the Fraud Unit. The main focus in supervising this caseload is to collect all monies ordered by the court, i.e., restitution, court costs, supervision fees, as quickly as possible. Once collected, we request the court for early termination of the probationary period.

The efforts of the Fraud Unit of the Philadelphia Adult Probation and Parole Department, working in collaboration with the District Attorney’s Office and the Office of Inspector General, have resulted in a valuable service being provided to taxpayers.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE VIOLATOR EFFORT

by
Christopher Pandolfo
District Director
Chester District Office
Board of Probation and Parole
Chester, Pennsylvania
and
Patricia Azzara
Parole Supervisor
SAVE Project – Eagleville Hospital
Eagleville, Pennsylvania

The Substance Abuse Violator Effort (SAVE) project is an innovative strategy focused on diverting parole violators with primary substance abuse issues away from state prison beds and into a structured, 90 days residential therapeutic environment followed by a phased nine month period of intensive outpatient treatment coordinated with intensive parole supervision. SAVE is the collaborative effort of the Pennsylvania Department of Corrections (DOC), the Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole (PBPP), and Eagleville Hospital, a long established residential treatment facility located west of the Philadelphia metro region.

One perspective of the so called “war on drugs” is that in some respects it appears that it is a war of attrition that has had

the unintended consequence of over-populating correctional facilities with relatively non-violent substance abusing probation and parole violators at the expense of preempting prison bed space for the more violence prone and predatory offenders. Managed health care and prohibitive medical assistance eligibility requirements have contributed to this dilemma by all but excluding the possibility of substance abuse treatment for this population for lack of means to pay.

A rational correctional policy indicated a re-focus on priorities given available resources. Taking violence off the street is viewed as the primary and achievable goal of prison incapacitation. The SAVE strategy recognizes that the penal system alone cannot effectively fight and win a war on drugs. Partnerships and alliances formed with the community and its resources are thought to provide a more eclectic and flexible approach to better understanding and controlling the shifting patterns of crime and substance abuse.

The SAVE Program was designed around the idea of prison diversion. Rather than return someone to prison after being sanctioned for parole violations, he/she is “diverted” into a four phase year long continuum that specifically addresses the individual’s need for substance abuse treatment. Phase I consists of a 90 day inpatient drug and alcohol recovery program that is located at Eagleville Hospital. Medical detox is also provided to patients at Eagleville should it be deemed necessary. During Phase II, the parolee is returned to the community and participates in three months of intensive outpatient therapy, intensive parole supervision and varying degrees of electronic monitoring and curfews. Phases III and IV are also three months in length and, during these periods, the parolee attends outpatient therapy on a less frequent basis while the monitoring and curfews are relaxed or removed. Phase IV focuses on treatment that provides skills for relapse prevention, while the offender is still being closely supervised in the community. One of the unique factors of the program is that it works on a continuum basis; that is, if an individual is doing well, he/she moves forward. Should a parolee violate parole in some fashion during any of the four phases (relapse, break curfew, etc.), he/she can be pushed back to the previous phase of the program for a “refresher course.” Approximately five individuals have been returned to the inpatient phase for stabilization.

Parolees are referred to the SAVE Program by field agents. When someone violates their parole, they are exposed to a series of escalating sanctions by field staff, culminating in a conference with the District Director of the region. It is at this conference level that a parolee is referred to SAVE. If a District Director decides that someone is a good referral candidate, the Parole Supervisor of the SAVE Program will be contacted and will determine whether or not the individual fits the criteria for admission. The program accepts both violent and nonviolent offenders; however, an offender must not have a recent history of violence. A SAVE candidate must have at least one year left on the maximum expiration of his sentence. No one with open charges or warrants will be accepted. A client must have been paroled from a state correctional institution, as the Department of Corrections pays for the person’s stay during inpatient and for the outpatient therapy as well. SAVE also does not accept those who have severe mental health or medical problems, as Eagleville Hospital is not equipped to provide the constant care that these individuals may need. In addition, the subject’s referring field agent completes a risk/needs assessment form which,

by way of a numerical score, weighs the parolees needs against his present risk to the community.

When an individual enters the SAVE Program, he is automatically re-assigned to a parole agent who works exclusively with the program. The agent follows the parolee through all four phases and is actively involved in most aspects of the subject’s treatment. As a result, a unique relationship has developed between the SAVE agents, Eagleville Hospital staff, and the outpatient therapy providers. Each parolee’s case is treated as a team effort. The agents have regular meetings and conferences with both in and out patient therapists and most case decisions are only made with the consensus of all parties involved. If a client begins to slip backwards, there is a whole new range of “creative sanctions” that can be imposed; for example, weekend community service with the outpatient group. The creation of “treatment teams” has fostered excellent communication and cooperation between therapists and parole agents to make for more effective supervision.

The Commissioner of the Department of Corrections and PBPP Board Members identified statistical data revealing that the bulk of parole violators returning to prison for drug related technical parole violations originated from Philadelphia and the surrounding counties. Demographic and geographic factors clearly identified this region for the highest possible impact. A planning committee was formed composed of staff from PBPP, DOC, the hospital, a county prison treatment coordinator, and also included the three District Parole Managers whose districts covered the seven counties involved. Most turf issues were resolved through the planning and development stages. The program would be operated by the Chester District Parole Office where Eagleville Hospital is located. The three parole districts encompassing seven counties, DOC, and the hospital agreed to override their differences, cut through red tape, and put the program into implementation. This process of bureaucratic hurdle jumping was viewed as critical to program success.

The SAVE Program has been in existence since January 1997. In that time, 109 parolees have been referred to the program. Of those, 28 have failed, with only three being arrested for new criminal charges (none of the charges being violent). Most of the individuals who have failed absconded from the program in the second phase and only three actually left the grounds of Eagleville Hospital during the inpatient phase. The reasons for these failures are unknown; however, a consultant has been in place since the inception of SAVE who will be studying the program and providing evaluative feedback to both parole staff and treatment providers so that they may make adjustments to better suit the needs of the program.

Residential Substance Abuse Treatment (RSAT) is the alternative sister program to SAVE. RSAT went online in November 1997 with a target population is parole violators who, although in need of substance abuse treatment, are too high risk to remain in the community. Repeat violators who are looking at a more substantial period of back time (18 months or more) are also RSAT appropriate. An RSAT candidate is referred to the program at a first level parole hearing; that is, the individual has violated parole, is in prison and is appearing before a PBPP Hearing Examiner in order to establish probable cause for arrest as a technical parole violator. If deemed appropriate, the parolee will enter six months of inpatient therapy in a therapeutic community at one of two state correctional institutions. Fol-

lowing the inpatient piece, the individual will be released to a community-based halfway house setting for six months of follow-up treatment. The concept for RSAT developed from the same rationale as SAVE and both programs are designed to provide a unique alternative to traditional imprisonment for technical parole violators with substance abuse issues.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

WAHL TAKES NEW POSITION

On January 19, 1998, **Ray Wahl** assumed the position of Juvenile Court Administrator with the Utah Administrative Office of the Courts. Prior to his new responsibilities, Wahl was Director of Field Operations for the Utah Department of Corrections. In addition to being an active member of the National Association of Probation Executives, Wahl is President-Elect of the American Probation and Parole Association.

ACA DEVELOPS ETHICS TRAINING COURSE

The American Corrections Association recently developed a video-based training course on *Ethics in Corrections*. The training package includes a comprehensive leader's guide and a set of three videotapes. The leader's guide includes suggestions and directions for presenting the training. Tips are provided for lecturing, group work, and using the videotapes. The videotapes feature **Sam S. Souryal**, Professor of Criminal Justice Ethics at Sam Houston State University in Huntsville, Texas.

- Tape 1 – *Understanding Ethics* — defines ethics and explains why ethical considerations are important in corrections.
- Tape 2 – *Doing the Right Thing* — examines the concept of loyalty in regard to reporting illegal acts.
- Tape 3 – *Making Ethical Choices* — discusses the correctional sub-culture and the role of discretion in corrections.

This training package may be ordered at a cost of \$315.00 from the American Correctional Association by calling 1-800-222-5646.

SCHOENLEBER ANNOUNCES RETIREMENT

Carol J. Schoenleber, Probation Administrator for the State of Nebraska, recently announced plans to retire, effective March 31, 1998.

She began her community corrections career in 1964 as a secretary in the District No. 6 Nebraska Probation Office. When the State Probation Administrator's position was created in 1971, Schoenleber was appointed Administrative Assistant to **Ed Garrison**, the first Probation Administrator in Nebraska. In 1979, **Bob Keller** was named Administrator and Schoenleber was appointed Deputy Administrator. Upon Keller's death in 1989, she was appointed State Probation Administrator and was also appointed to fill his unexpired term on the Board of Directors of the American Probation and Parole Association.

In addition to her involvement with the American Probation and Parole Association, Schoenleber is also a member of the National Association of Probation Executives.

In reflecting on the close of her 35-year career in community corrections, Schoenleber wrote:

I have appreciated the friendship and assistance from NAPE and APPA but I am truly looking forward to another phase of new opportunities in retirement. Thanks to all!

After March 31, 1998, Schoenleber can be reached at 1225 Garfield Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68502; her telephone number is (402) 435-2866.

WYETT RETIRES

On March 3, 1998, **Richard E. Wyett**, Chief of the Parole and Probation Division for the State of Nevada, retired to pursue other endeavors.

The following article, written by columnist **Jim Weller**, appeared in the February 24, 1998, issue of the Carson City *Nevada Appeal*.

Rich Wyett will soon retire after serving Nevadans for more than 25 years. As one of a very few blacks to rise to a senior management position in state government, he can take a great amount of pride in the contributions he has made, especially during the past five years as chief of the Parole and Probation Division.

Richard Earl Wyett was born in New Orleans, Louisiana, 56 years ago, living there until he graduated from high school. His mother and sister, the latter a sergeant in the New Orleans Police Department, still resides there. Uncles in Detroit and Reno also contributed to his development. Rich served in the U. S. Army for six years, two on active duty and four in the reserve. He has lived in the Reno area since May 1966. His wife, Cindy, is an investigator with the Washoe County District Attorney's Office. They have three children.

After working in private industry for six years and serving as a Reno Police department auxiliary officer, Rich joined the Nevada Highway Patrol as a trooper. Transferring to Parole and Probation two years later, he rose through the ranks to unit manager.

In 1991 he was appointed by Governor Miller to the Parole Board. In February 1993 the governor appointed him as the director of the then Department of Parole and Probation. Later that year, Parole and Probation was merged into the Department of Motor Vehicles and Public Safety as a division in the Public Safety Branch.

Parole and Probation is a unique agency. Officers are both a peace officer and a counselor/social services representative. Their authority and responsibility in supervising parolees and probationers, about 15,000 statewide, is demanding. They deal with more felons in a day than many do in a career. The job as a parole and probation officer is one of the toughest and potentially the most dangerous.

As the new chief of Parole and Probation, Wyett took over a troubled agency. Morale was low, officer safety equipment was inadequate; insufficient personnel, and archaic records management system, outdated office space and office equipment were other problems. Working with department staff, Rich was able to turn Parole and Probation in a new direction.

The agency now enjoys larger size vehicles, essential for officer safety in transporting prisoners. Other improvements include state-purchased and standardized firearms (previously the officer had to furnish his own and there was little standardization) and protective vests (before, they retrieved those that were being discarded by other agencies).

Radio communications have improved significantly, and a computerized record keeping system has been developed. Wyett initi-

ated regular meetings with the various labor associations representing his employees.

Subsequent to the tragic death of Sparks officer Larry Don Johnson, Parole and Probation, under Chief Wyett's direction, worked with other law enforcement agencies, particularly Dick Kirkland and the Washoe County Sheriff's Office, in developing the Dangerous Offender Notification System. This computerized system alerts law enforcement officers making a street stop as to the parole and probation status, if any, of the individual.

Rich has personally led the effort to move Nevada Parole and Probation into the national theater. He is a director in the National Association of Probation Executives, and serves as an adjunct instructor at Sam Houston State University on behalf of the National Institute of Corrections, Department of Justice. He has made several verbal and written presentations to local, state, and national organizations.

As he retires March 3, he will do so knowing that what he did during his state employment, especially during the past five years, made a difference — a big difference. Congratulations to Rich.

Wyett, recently elected to the Board of Directors of the National Association of Probation Executives, plans to remain involved. He is looking at a couple of options that will keep him active in community corrections. Wyett plans to devote some of his time to membership recruitment in the Association. His mailing address is 7220 History Drive, Reno, Nevada 89502; his telephone number is (702) 856-4810 and his e-mail is <wyett@aci.net>.

FAULKNER RECEIVES AWARD

J. Richard (Rick) Faulkner, Jr., is the recipient of the 1997 National Institute of Corrections Deputy Director's Award. Nominated for this recognition by **George M. Keiser**, Chief of the Community Corrections Division, Faulkner was cited for his resourcefulness and creativity, responsiveness to the field, conscientious management of his workload, and a host of positive personal qualities. More specifically, Faulkner was recognized for developing and delivering an Executive Development Program for new probation executives, managing several networks of community corrections administrators, promoting the implementation of new community corrections and law enforcement "partnerships," and developing a monograph and training course on staff safety for community corrections professionals.

On March 9, 1998, **Larry Solomon**, Deputy Director of the National Institute of Corrections, presented Faulkner with a plaque in recognition of his unselfish service to community corrections.

NEW MEMBERS

Since the Fall 1997 issue of *Executive Exchange*, seven new members have joined the National Association of Probation Executives; they are as follows:

Vicki L. Spriggs, Executive Director, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, 4900 North Lamar, 5th Floor, Austin, Texas 78751.

Steve Bonnell, Deputy Executive Director, Texas Juvenile Probation Commission, 4900 North Lamar, 5th Floor, Austin, Texas 78751.

Warren R. Emmer, Director, North Dakota Division of Parole and Probation, P.O. Box 5521, Bismarck, North Dakota 58501.

Barbara Descher, Board Member, Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole, 3101 North front Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17110.

Michael E. Santese, Deputy Director for Operations, Office of Adult Probation, 2275 Silas Deane Highway, Rocky Hill, Connecticut 06067.

Christina M. Ball, Director of Programs and Services, Marion Superior Court Probation Department, 200 East Washington Street, Room T322, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204.

Richard Gaskell, Assistant Administrator, Adult Probation and Parole, Department of Corrections, One Dorrance Plaza, Providence, Rhode Island 02903.

INFORMATION ABOUT EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

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

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

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

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

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

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

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES

Who We Are

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

What We Do

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

Types of Membership

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

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

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

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

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

Why Join

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

Membership Application (TAX # 58-1497263)

NAME _____ TITLE _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE # _____ FAX # _____ DATE OF APPLICATION _____

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

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

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