

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

WINTER 1999

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

In my first President's message to the NAPE membership last year and during the NAPE Board of Directors meeting last August in Norfolk, I emphasized a number of goals and objectives for my two year term as President. One of the tenets which I emphasized on both occasions was the creative use of volunteers within our respective probation agencies. This concept is not new, and we have all been exposed to volunteerism and its advantages during our administrative careers. Since the concept is not novel, there is a tendency to dismiss it with a "been there, done that" mentality. While that response may have been fitting years ago, I am challenging all NAPE members to revisit the concept as we approach the millennium since volunteers remain a community resource of unfathomable importance and value. I know of no better process or method to better engage the community in local community corrections operations.

For the minority of probation administrators who do not utilize volunteers, I am suggesting that you reexplore the concept with this edition of *Executive Exchange*, which contains an excellent article by Gerald Dash, Director of the Detroit-based Volunteers in Prevention, Probation, and Prisons, Inc., entitled "Working to Put the 'Community' in Corrections." Mr. Dash's article provides helpful information to probation agen-



cies which have embraced the volunteer concept. To those systems and administrators I challenge you to explore volunteer usage in non-traditional ways; step outside the box and consider with your administrative and direct service personnel innovative and novel methods to involve volunteers in the services and programs sponsored by your respective departments. Mr. Dash's organization, which has experienced phenomenal growth in recent years, is an excellent resource for administrators who wish to develop or expand volunteer offerings in their respective agencies.

On an unrelated note for those of you planning to attend APPA/NAPE in New York City this coming August, let me encourage you to finalize your travel plans now, especially your lodging reservations. Rooms at the available rate are going quickly, and to ensure accommodations at the lowest and best rate, now is the time to act.

In closing, I extend my fullest appreciation to the several contributors to this edition of *Executive Exchange*, and I thank them most genuinely for their time and effort. I hope to see many of you at the APPA/NAPE events this coming summer. In the interim, enjoy the approaching spring and summer months.

Robert L. Bingham
President

CONTENTS

President's Message, Robert L. Bingham	1
Working to Put the "Community" in Corrections, F. Gerald Dash	2
Neighborhood Accountability Boards, Jeffrey R. Bidmon, Laura Garnette, and Toni Spencer	4
Commitment to Parenting, Robert L. Bingham	7
The Use of Psychological Evaluations in Juvenile Cases, Bernard Gaulier, Ph.D., and Pamela S. Howitt, Ph.D.	8
Commitment to Staff Safety, Pamela S. Howitt, Ph.D.	9
News From The Field	10

VOLUNTEERS IN PREVENTION, PROBATION, AND PRISONS: WORKING TO PUT THE “COMMUNITY” IN CORRECTIONS

by
F. Gerald Dash
Executive Director
Volunteers in Prevention, Probation, and Prisons, Inc.
Detroit, Michigan

History and Background

In 1959, a young attorney by the name of Keith Leenhouts was elected to the bench of the Municipal Court located in Royal Oak, Michigan, which is a community of 100,000 people located north of Detroit. A few years after beginning his term on the bench, Judge Leenhouts became frustrated due to the quality of services that were being provided to young misdeameant offenders who were being sentenced in his court. The customary sentence comprised of probation, fines and jail time was not working effectively. This was evidenced by the rate of recidivism, not only in the Royal Oak Court, but in courts located in other communities.

Out of his frustration, Judge Leenhouts gathered eight of his closest friends to discuss the problem and to seek a solution. The group came up with a simple, but what was to prove, very effective solution. In addition to traditional court sanctions of probation, fines and/or jail time, the group suggested that each offender also be matched with an “inspirational personality,” someone who could guide and provide discipline within their lives. Each of the eight then became the first “one-to-one” volunteers in Judge Leenhout’s court. Each was subsequently assigned to an offender whom they would meet with for a minimum of one hour, once a week. Each assignment continued for the duration of the offender’s sentence to probation, typically one year.

As time went on, the impact these eight volunteers were having on the attitudes and behaviors of offenders coming through the Royal Oak Court was truly amazing. Through their consistent weekly meetings, the volunteers were beginning to discover the underlying problems of these probationers, problems that the court never saw, which likely were at the root of their delinquent and criminal behaviors. The volunteers then began to develop resources in the community to deal with the problems that they were uncovering through their regular weekly meetings. One frustration set in though. While they were observing dramatic changes in the attitudes and behaviors of the probationers they were working with, there were hundreds of other young people proceeding through the court who needed similar “one-to-one” support. This frustration brought the eight volunteers back to Judge Leenhouts with a convincing recommendation to open up the “one-to-one” program to the entire Royal Oak community.

With Judge Leenhout’s support, the program was promoted to the community and the community responded. Within a few short years, over 500 citizens became involved in the program, the majority as “one-to-one” volunteers who worked weekly

article, entitled “Satisfaction and Perception of Needs of Managers of Criminal Justice Volunteer Programs: A Preliminary Report,” was published in *Volunteer Administration Journal*, 13:13-15, Spring, 1980. This article was also written by Judge Leenhouts and Dr. Sigler. Each of these cited journal articles provided further validation relative to the usefulness of the data generated by the 1979 national survey conducted by VIP.

In 1986, VIP undertook another survey which was not as comprehensive as the 1979 survey. The 1986 survey was more of a sampling of the current status of programs that replied to the 1979 survey and programs VIP knew about which started after 1979. While 50,000 survey cards were mailed in 1979, a total of 5,262 requests were mailed in 1986. The results of this survey validated the results of the 1979 survey and indicated similar numbers of programs, volunteers and clients being served.

Though not as extensive as previous surveys, VIP recently concluded a national survey and needs assessment initiative which was funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation of Battle Creek, Michigan. From data gathered, VIP estimates that several thousand volunteer programs presently exist in communities across the country and that these programs, used in conjunction with traditional probation and parole services, have presumably deterred over three million adult and juvenile offenders from further delinquent and criminal behavior.

A Sampling of Volunteer Programs Which Currently Exist

Over the past three decades, thousands of volunteer programs have been started by judges, probation and parole officers and by concerned citizens from local communities. Today, you can find these programs in almost every sector of the juvenile and criminal justice system. In these programs you see volunteers involved in a variety of roles. Most common though, you will find volunteers working “one-to-one” with offenders who are under the supervision of the court, probation and/or parole departments or juvenile or adult institutions. In this capacity, volunteers work hand-in-hand with judges, probation and parole officers, and correctional staff with the common goal of curbing delinquency and criminal behavior in the offenders with whom they work.

Examples of existing volunteer programs that work within the juvenile and criminal justice system include VIP’s own Detroit Partners Against Crime Youth Mentoring Program. VIP’s Detroit program trains community volunteers to work one-to-one with juvenile probationers who are referred to the program by judges and prosecutors from the Circuit Court for the Third Judicial Circuit of Michigan – Family Division – Juvenile Section (formerly the Wayne County Probate Court) that serves the City of Detroit.

In New Orleans a program was initiated entitled New Orleans Volunteers in Court (NOVIC). Within the NOVIC program trained volunteers are matched with felony drug offenders who are referred by judges within the New Orleans Criminal District Court. In Denver, a program started by a group of judges called Partners, Inc., developed into over nine chapters which has served over 20,000 at-risk youth through involvement in one-to-one relationships with positive, caring adults. The Partners program serves as a diversionary/probation alternative for the police and Juvenile Court, accepting youth between the ages of eight and 18 years of age who are at risk of becoming chronic repeat offenders.

In New Jersey, four counties became involved in a collaborative effort with the Family Court involving mentors with juvenile delinquents. In this model, seven to twelve volunteers are mobilized into CARE Teams and are responsible for the management of the same number of youth. Probation officers are then assigned to supervise from two to three CARE Teams, and convene the Team monthly for youth interviews, treatment plan reviews and community networking/linkage of needed services.

In London, Ontario, Canada, a volunteer parole model has been developed where trained volunteers are working intensively in all aspects of parole operations. Large or small, urban or rural, juvenile and criminal justice volunteer programs can be found within the basic operations of a vast number of courts, probation and parole departments and correctional institutions across the United States and Canada.

Effectiveness of Volunteer Programs in Juvenile and Criminal Justice

The effectiveness of volunteer programs in juvenile and criminal justice has been validated through independent studies that have been conducted over the years on programs across the country. For example, during the 1970s and 1980s, the Partners Program in Denver, Colorado, underwent six (6) independent research studies. The studies consistently showed the Partners group to have recidivism rates 42% lower than a comparison, non-Partner matched group.

In California, a program called M-2 Sponsors matched thousands of trained volunteers with adult and juvenile offenders in correctional institutions throughout California. The target population of this program was inmates who were completely isolated (alienated) from the outside world. In 1987, the California Department of Corrections contracted with EMT Associates to conduct an independent evaluation of the M-2 program to determine the effect the program was having on parole success. The study demonstrated that inmates receiving 12 or more M-2 visits showed an 81% improvement in completing their parole requirements after 24 months as compared to a non-matched group.

Other independent studies conducted on volunteer programs over the years have demonstrated similar results. For example, in the juvenile mentoring program in New Jersey, recidivism was reduced by 50% in youth who were matched with trained mentors. In VIP’s Detroit Partners Against Crime Volunteer Program, a study completed in 1996 indicated that mentored adult probationers who predominantly had assault & battery records had recidivism rates 38% lower than non-mentored adult probationers (14.3% versus 30%) and 50% lower than those adult probationers who refused to participate in the program.

In a recent study cited by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention which was conducted on Big Brother Big Sister programs, mentored youth were 46% less likely than a control group to initiate drug use. This finding was even stronger for minority youth who were 70% less likely to initiate drug use when in a positive mentoring relationship. Mentored youth were 27% less likely than the control group to initiate alcohol use. Mentored youth were also less assaultive, skipped fewer days in school and had much better relationships with their parent(s). Consistently, the intelligent use of well-trained

volunteers has allowed courts, prisons, aftercare programs, and probation and parole departments to increase their effectiveness with offenders more than eleven times over in a very cost-effective manner.

Today’s Need for “One-To-One” Volunteer Involvement

Today’s need for effective and supportive volunteer programs within our courts, prisons, jails, and probation and parole departments is greater than ever. Our intensive focus on prison and jail construction programs has had a devastating impact on the budgets of courts and probation and parole departments across the nation. This has resulted in overflowing court dockets along with the increased use of probation and /or parole to catch the overflow of prison and jail overcrowding. Probation and parole personnel have had to take on greater caseloads, often at the expense of supervising probationers and /or parolees less carefully.

These conditions have forced juvenile and criminal justice practitioners to face a severe dilemma. With court dockets overflowing, probation and parole caseloads increasing, and with budgets shrinking, the system has had to rethink its response to offenders. This is an area in which community volunteers can be amassed into a powerful force to help in a variety of ways, especially direct “one-to-one” support of juvenile and adult offenders who are under court, probation or parole supervision. From a pure financial perspective, it is far more cost-effective to deal with an offender at the early stages of his or her criminal career at a cost of \$1,000 per year or less than to eventually incarcerate that same individual at a cost of \$12,000 per year or more.

Resources Available Which Can Support Volunteer Program Development

VIP’s current mission is to see recidivism reduced in the juvenile and criminal justice systems. VIP fulfills its mission by encouraging and supporting the use of volunteers in juvenile and criminal justice operations. VIP encourages and supports the development of volunteer programs in the juvenile and criminal justice field by offering direct training support and by offering a Professional Membership Program through which program contacts and development resources can be secured.

Through structured two-day Training & Networking Institutes that are offered periodically throughout the year, VIP delivers training support that is needed to begin a new volunteer program or to strengthen an existing volunteer program. At the core of each VIP Training & Networking Institute is the VIP “Show-Me” Series. The “Show-Me” Series is comprised of eight training modules of 1-1 /4 hours each. The eight training modules include:

- “Show-Me” The Planning
- “Show-Me” The Recruitment
- “Show-Me” The Training – Part I
- “Show-Me” The Training – Part II
- “Show-Me” The Paperwork
- “Show-Me” The Money
- “Show-Me” The Risk Management
- “Show-Me” The Evaluation

VIP’s eight core “Show-Me” training modules are supplemented through other workshop opportunities on topics related to the operation of volunteer programs in the juvenile and criminal justice field. Upon request, VIP also conducts intensive two-day training sessions based solely on its successful “Show-Me” Training Series. These intensive two-day seminars are conducted “by request,” on a cost-reimbursement and per diem expense basis.

In addition to its training programs, VIP also offers Professional Membership opportunities. VIP Professional Members receive reduced rates at all VIP Training & Networking Institutes, receive special mailings and have Internet access to VIP’s Resource Library for Justice Volunteer Management.

For further information about VIP, you can write VIP at 163 Madison Avenue, Detroit, Michigan 48226; you can contact VIP at 313-964-1110 or you can fax VIP at 313-964-1145. If you have a computer and access to the Internet, you can e-mail VIP at vip-pac@bigfoot.com or you can visit VIP’s web-site at <http://comnet.org/vip> which will provide you with detailed, updated information regarding VIP activities and services.

NEIGHBORHOOD ACCOUNTABILITY BOARDS: THE SANTA CRUZ COUNTY APPROACH

by
Jeffrey R. Bidmon
Laura Garnette
Toni Spencer

Deputy Probation Officers
Santa Cruz County Probation Department
Santa Cruz, California

Santa Cruz County is set in an idyllic natural environment. With the Pacific Ocean serving as its western border, the rugged Santa Cruz Mountain Range stretching to the north and east and the rich agricultural land of the Pajaro Valley extending to the south; this 441 square mile area has a population of nearly 250,000. A diverse cultural mosaic, the county is home to immigrant farm workers, small business owners, Silicon Valley corporate leaders, students and professors from the University of California campus, and lifelong residents. Both the area’s geography and cultural composition create formidable challenges to political leaders and policy makers charged with balancing the needs and demands of the community at large.

With the exception of substance abuse rates, reported as higher than the national average, Santa Cruz County has experienced overall decreases in violent crime which correspond to national trends. This has not always been the case. As a result, law enforcement agencies came under close scrutiny by constituents who sought to restore the image of their community as being a safe place to live. Led by the work of the County Sheriff and the Chiefs of Police, innovative community policing approaches began to take root. A shift in priorities allowed for more of a partnership between law enforcement and the public. Among the benefits realized by this approach were increases in the number of Neighborhood Crime Watch areas, higher rates

of volunteerism, and a general sense that the police were more involved as active members of the communities being served. Concurrent to the growing popularity and successes of community policing was the renewed interest in the complimentary approach of prevention and early intervention with juvenile offenders. System of Care (a California Mental Health reform model for the delivery of social services, which seeks to provide consumers with the greatest benefit at the lowest cost for the available public funds) nurtured collaboration among government agencies and community based organizations. This paved the way for innovative and creative programs to emerge. An emphasis was placed on finding ways to engage communities in the process of crafting solutions to the broad spectrum of problems faced, when dealing with crime. The balance of this article will discuss the specific efforts of the Santa Cruz County Probation Department and their involvement with communities in the development of Neighborhood Accountability Boards (NABs). Before doing so, however, it seems important to provide a context within which the probation department refocused its philosophy and aligned more closely with the principles of Restorative Justice.

The probation department in Santa Cruz has always been interested in fostering creativity, while keeping pace with contemporary “best practices.” It was not much of a surprise then, when a few years ago, a substantial amount of Restorative Justice literature circulated throughout the department. This sparked a hearty collegial debate, and a wide scope of views emerged. Justice system reforms occurring internationally, inspired the rethinking of our mission and goals, allowing for the potential redistribution of agency resources. Welfare Reform legislation on federal and state levels seemed to provide the proper moment in time to demonstrate the congruity of the new public assistance priorities and the competency building potential of Restorative Justice programming.

With the help of welfare reform funding, three new staff positions were created within the probation department, with specific objectives to address issues of employment development, community resources and victim’s services. The individuals assigned relate to each other interdependently, sharing areas of overlapping interest. Each is involved in the development of Restorative Justice programs. Initial priority was given to the development of victim’s services, as this was identified as an area of great need and thin resources. An array of programs are currently being implemented, some of which are expected to serve as resources for the NABs. In retrospect, the decision to attend to victims first contributed to the natural progression of Restorative Justice programming, in that it helped to shape decisions made later regarding the victims’ involvement in the NABs.

The department’s current focus is the incubation and growth of Neighborhood Accountability Boards. Legal authority for the Neighborhood Accountability Boards lies in the State’s Welfare and Institution Code and Federal Title 13. The federal guidelines specifically direct probation to consult with the victim and, to involve the community in drawing up an agreement and supervising the offender. The section of the California Welfare and Institutions Code defining informal probation, compels the probation officer to make a diligent effort to proceed under that section when probation determines that the interest of the community and the offender can both be protected. While Santa Cruz County has made wide and effective use of diversion and informal handling through the years, it is only now

with the focus on Balanced and Restorative Justice that due notice is being taken of the victim, and “community” has been regarded in its most literal sense.

The intent of the department is to make handling of cases by NABs an option in all county jurisdictions. Following a literature review, a contingent from Santa Cruz County visited a NAB in Sacramento County and met with their staff. Participants included two community members, a University intern, a Police Department Sargent and three probation officers. The group returned with a commitment from both the Police Department and the Rotary to assist in the creation, training and management of boards. An in depth look at other counties was undertaken and was followed by a discussion of the unique strengths and limitations that would shape the Santa Cruz boards. The following essential elements of board framework were identified: involvement of crime victims whenever possible; effective case management; meaningful community service projects; candidate screening by offense rather than by offender characteristics; maintaining a balanced focus; careful preparation of all parties; and ensuring a voluntary and respectful process.

Building on the awareness of victim’s issues, the involvement of victims was made the first priority in Santa Cruz’s boards. Including the victim in the process relieves the probation officer of the role of intermediary and both the victim and the offender stand to gain if the systemic distance between them is eliminated. Should the offense not have a singular or immediately identifiable victim, a community person who is most affected by the offense will be invited. If, for example, a neighborhood park suffers graffiti vandalism, the victim might be represented by the park employee charged with the clean-up or a park-user and resident of a nearby home. While inclusion of the victim creates some challenges, it also provides a better opportunity for restorative goals to be met. Victims deserve to have a say in crafting reparative solutions and having any questions answered. Ideally, this process will foster reciprocal compassion.

Another element setting the NABs apart from the traditional way of dealing with minor offenses, is the inclusion of a case manager. That individual will support the offender in the completion of the requirements of the NAB contract and hold them accountable if they fail to meet those requirements. It is envisioned that this position could be held by an employee of a community based organization, probation staff or a community member. One of the contract requirements will almost certainly include involvement for the youth in meaningful service to their own community. The board will identify service projects that reflect the true needs of their community, thereby, providing an opportunity for the youth to be perceived as offering something of value. Already proposed by a potential board member in a rural part of the county, is a project involving youth in cutting and delivering firewood to elderly residents. Such an area specific project will work best if organized by people living within that locale and will serve to strengthen the region’s participation in the cultivation of NAB resources. Some active restorative projects developed with the community in this manner include: an existing youth garden program where delinquent teens practice horticultural, sustainable agricultural and entrepreneurial skills, while providing low cost garden products to the community; and a community work crew which handles graffiti clean-up, non indigenous plant removal, flood abatement; and building maintenance. When poor weather preempts outdoor work, this crew’s participants are tutored in employment readiness skills. It is also anticipated that NAB sanctions may include

the youth working directly for the victim or for a charity selected by the victim.

Candidates for NABs will be screened by offense instead of by offender. A juvenile who is already on probation and commits a crime that is relatively minor, may still be eligible for participation in a NAB. Not only would this practice reduce the number of cases heard in an already overcrowded court, but the sanction could be more specific to the elements of the crime. Holding some of these juveniles accountable to the communities in which they live may prove more effective in repairing the harm they cause. This option becomes even more attractive when considering the possible loss of impact rendered by an over-exposure to the juvenile court.

Well meaning adults often spend considerable time trying to determine exactly what makes a youth behave in an aberrant way. At worst, this form of over-analysis can have a paralyzing effect on the delivery of relevant services, and at best, it perpetuates the all too common pattern of focusing primarily on the offender. Research indicates that meaningful relationships with appropriate adults are paramount in strengthening bonds to the community. It has been further demonstrated that the more bonded youth are to their community, the less likely they will be to engage in delinquent behavior. Since NABs are not counseling sessions, the board is more likely to view the harm caused by the crime as a conflict between the juvenile and his/her victim or community. The process of working through these conflicts is expected to build relationships and fortify bonds between young people and their community elders.

In order to offer balanced solutions, all parties must be adequately prepared and know that their involvement remains voluntary throughout the process. There will be considerable focus placed on pre-hearing preparation to insure that the involved parties are ready to face one another and can do so in a respectful manner. Establishing simple ground rules and holding to effective communication skills will help to keep the process moving in a productive direction.

As probation representatives visited existing community organizations to present the concept of the NABs, they were consistently met with enthusiasm. The depth of community interest was immediately apparent in all jurisdictions. One law enforcement agency in the county staffs a full time Victim Advocate, an aspect that was particularly appealing, given the intent to involve victims in the process. That agency has made their advocate available to a NABs in their community. In a rural part of the county, a local non-profit agency has done extensive work in the process of defining community values and has an active and passionate volunteer base. They have offered of staff time and support, both critical, as the probation department currently has limited resources in this area. By necessity, just as much as design, Santa Cruz County began to genuinely rely on the communities themselves to bring about the creation and management of the boards.

As the pace quickens towards the inauguration of Santa Cruz County's first boards, probation staff involved in the endeavor are struck most by the breadth of knowledge and insight offered by the communities initially targeted. This has provided a resolute understanding that sincerity in the collaborative process will involve practitioner humility and the sharing of traditional authority. While restorative justice practices have created an exciting systemic shift, many community members have long held the philosophy that neighborhood problems can be best

addressed on a local level. It is our intent to participate in creating an environment where traditional wisdom resurfaces, and serves to buttress contemporary community values. The development of Neighborhood Accountability Boards is one example of this ambitious goal. Others become apparent as services within our department reorganize around Restorative Justice themes. There is general agreement among staff, that we still have a considerable distance to travel. However, every internal interaction that mirrors a restorative idea builds upon the emergence of a restorative culture in our greater community.

Toni Spencer, Laura Garnette and Jeff Bidmon comprise the core of the Santa Cruz County Probation Department's Restorative Justice Initiative. They are collectively responsible for advancing victims' services, youth employment development and the cultivation of community resources. This paper is a product of their commitment to the process of shared authority and shared responsibility, both necessary, if collaborative endeavors are to succeed.

INFORMATION ABOUT EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMMITMENT TO PARENTING

by
Robert L. Bingham
Administrator, Family Division
Oakland County Circuit Court
Pontiac, Michigan

Theories concerning delinquency and crime prevention have existed for centuries. During the Middle Ages, demonological theory blamed delinquency and crime on supernatural spirits (Regoli and Hewitt, 1991). Eighteenth Century Classical theorists stressed free will as the deciding factor which separated conventional behavior from delinquent/criminal activity; fear of criminal sanctions was thought to deter most citizens from breaking the law. Positivism stressed biological factors: physical evolution, body physique, genetic structure and chromosomal abnormalities, and biological predisposition (Senna and Siegel, 1987). Recently, the influence of allergies, diet, and television violence have also been explored as possible links with anti-social behavior.

Psychological theories of crime and delinquency have been heavily influenced by Freudian psychoanalytic theory. Cognitive psychologists are concerned with individual perception and mental representation of the world (Senna and Siegel, 1987). Psychologist Stanton Samenow, a leader in the cognitive school, believes that it is imperative for delinquents and criminals to change their thinking about crime in order for a cessation in criminal behavior to occur (Champion, 1989).

To complicate the picture, sociological theories abound. Most prominent are Durkheim and Merton's theory of anomie, Cloward and Ohlin's theory of opportunity, Sutherland's theory of differential association, Hirshi's social bond theory (Senna and Siegel, 1987), labeling theory as championed by Erving Goffman and Edwin Schur (Regoli and Hewitt, 1991), and conflict theory as interpreted and advanced by numerous radical criminologists (Senna and Siegel, 1987).

To date, no clear and definitive causation theory has emerged to gain wide acceptance. Most academicians, jurists, and practitioners within the juvenile justice system recognize and appreciate the importance which physical and family environment play in the development of delinquent and criminal tendencies. Few individuals question why so many inner-city, disadvantaged youth develop delinquent careers, but to throw the causation argument into even further disarray and confusion, how does one explain children from this same environment who rise above almost overwhelming odds to academically and vocationally succeed in life? And furthermore, how does one rationalize the middle class, intact family youth from suburbia who kills his/her parents, or sexually assaults a six year old neighbor, or brazenly attempts an armed robbery of a local bank in broad daylight? Perhaps the answer lies in the dysfunction of the American family and the unwillingness to parent.

Within the last thirty years, family therapy has emerged as a viable and effective treatment medium for delinquent children, their parents, and their siblings. No longer is the family overlooked as the critical conduit between society and the child. As renowned family therapist Virginia Satir (1967) noted: "the family system is the main learning context for individual behavior,

thoughts, feelings. How parents teach a child is just as important as what they teach."

A main tenet to family therapy is that children respond to stresses affecting the family. While teenagers frequently show poor impulse control and are highly prone to peer pressure, their outward behaviors are clearly influenced by familial circumstances. The 15-year-old boy who is emotionally berated by his stepfather, may displace his anger by physically attacking a younger, more vulnerable victim. The 12-year-old "wanna be" may turn to gangs for support and recognition when he is emotionally ignored by his parents. A 10-year-old boy is arrested for shoplifting a pound of bacon to fee his hungry siblings because his parents have been absent from the home for several days.

However, there is another pathology affecting families today, and it does not involve drugs, alcohol, infidelity, domestic violence, or any other social ill; that pathology is the indifference of parents to recognize and accept and embrace the commitment to parent.

A minuscule percentage of the human work force ever attain positions of extreme significance. Nonetheless, many Americans demonstrate and espouse a work ethic which is characterized by commitment, pride, hard work, and long hours. This formula basically breeds success in the work place, but does the principle likewise apply to family and the parenting role? At a time when the institution of family is being stressed and pressured like never before, is there a successful key to the task of parenting?

In my role as a juvenile justice administrator and part-time criminal justice instructor, I have been queried numerous times about delinquency and its causation. While environment and economic status play key roles, I am postulating that the greatest deterrent to delinquency is the commitment to parent. In our modern-day world of microwaves, remote controls, and cellular phones, it is easy to be distracted from the ongoing commitment that is required. By commitment, I am not simply referring to providing adequate shelter, clothing, and food, but rather, I am advocating for the ongoing and never ending work that is required to meet a child's total social and emotional needs. Because of the multiple demands of parenting, successful parents make needed and appropriate adjustments within their own lives to accommodate the needs of their children. However, a common pattern found in many parents of delinquent youth is that these adults fail to make alterations. The successful rearing of their children is not a priority, but the ongoing maintenance of their personal needs is.

This pattern of non-commitment is not indigenous to the parents of delinquents. As children approach adolescence, there is a natural tendency for all parents to relax or coast. The children are becoming more self-sufficient and independent. In many tangible ways, they no longer need the intense physical caretaking which they required as infants and small children. However, the need for love, discipline, moral and spiritual direction, and support is every bit as great. The commitment to parent principle is in no way common to the intact middle class family. Although it experiences greater challenge within impoverished communities because of environmental stressors, it may be the answer as to why select high-risk youngsters triumph over the evils of the streets. The concept is also compatible with divorced couples who set their marital issues aside in the best interest of their children.

For parenting to be successful, parents must accept and commit to the role's strenuous demands. While parents may not

wish to continue the sacrifices demanded by their child's early years, it is the wise parent who continues to practice intense interest to the child's social, emotional, educational and recreational needs. By accepting this rigorous role, parents are taking the most significant step toward ensuring the emotional well being of their children, and in turn, they are exercising the maximum effort toward preventing delinquency and the onset of an adult criminal career.

Delinquency prevention truly begins in the home. While the parenting role is demanding, stressful, and never ending, it is also the most important challenge which most of us will ever undertake in life. In that spirit, it demands our fullest and most genuine attention and energy. Recall the words of famed family therapist Virginia Satir (1967): "How parents teach a child is just as important as what they teach."

References

Champion, Dean J. (1989). *Criminal Justice in the United States*. Columbus, OH: Merrill Publishing Company.

Regoli, Robert M.and John D. Hewitt (1991). *Delinquency in Society*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Satir, Virginia (1967). *Conjoint Family Therapy*. Palo Alto, CA: Science and Behavior Books.

Senna, Joseph J. and Larry J. Siegel (1987). *Introduction to Criminal Justice*. St. Paul: West Publishing Company.

THE USE OF PSYCHOLOGICAL EVALUATIONS IN JUVENILE CASES

by
Bernard Gaulier, Ph.D.
Chief, Clinical Services
and
Pamela S. Howitt, Ph.D.

Deputy Court Administrator, Family Division
Oakland County Circuit Court
Pontiac, Michigan

Children and adolescents who become involved with Juvenile Court often present with an array of intellectual, behavioral and emotional difficulties. These difficulties will have an impact on their ability to comply with a disposition order, and with their ability to become productive members of society later in life. Psychological evaluations are often used to assess the strengths and deficits of these youth. Recommendations are made for appropriate placement and services which will best meet the youth's needs, thereby reducing the likelihood of future recidivism.

Psychological evaluations must be performed by licensed psychologists. In Oakland County, many of these evaluations are performed by staff of the Probate Court/Circuit Court-Family Division's Clinical Services Unit. The clinic has been in existence for more than forty years, serving Probate Court, and now

Family Division judges and referees. The licensed clinical psychologists employed in the clinic have expertise in assessing juveniles who are adjudicated on delinquency matters, parents and children who are involved in neglect or abuse matters, and in the field of forensic psychology as a whole. The staff clinicians also have received training in and have experience testifying in Court as expert witnesses. Of the approximately 1200 psychological evaluations performed each year by the clinic staff, about 50% are for delinquency cases, 45% for neglect/abuse cases, and 5% for other Probate matters. Since the implementation of the Family Division on January 1st 1998, the clinic has also been called upon to perform psychological evaluations in domestic matters (e.g., custody, parenting time evaluations).

Most of the court-ordered evaluations in juvenile cases are performed after adjudication and before the disposition hearing. The request can be made because information available at the time of the adjudication indicates that the youth and/or the parent have any of an array of difficulties such as: problems learning; prior mental health treatment or psychiatric hospitalization; substance abuse; or any other reasons which suggest the presence of significant emotional problems which will need to be addressed. The request may also be made because of the nature of the offense. For example, adjudication on a charge of criminal sexual conduct will likely necessitate an evaluation specific to sex offenders in order to assess the level of risk and the type of treatment needed.

In some cases, the psychological clinic is called upon to do evaluations prior to adjudication to help determine competency to stand trial, criminal responsibility, or diminished capacity. These evaluations may be requested because, for example, a youth charged with a crime may appear to be severely intellectually limited, or may have a history of serious psychiatric impairment. These specialized psychological evaluations will help the Court determine whether the youth in question has the ability to participate in the adjudication process. Pre-adjudication evaluations are also usually requested in waiver cases. The results of the evaluation will be used by the judge to decide whether to grant a waiver request so that a youth will stand trial in Circuit Court rather than in the Family Division.

The object of psychological evaluations performed for the Juvenile Court is to assess and describe the intellectual and emotional functioning of the individual(s) referred, and to use that information to develop a set of recommendations which address the referral question. When the referral is made to assist in dispositional planning, the report must address two fundamental questions: 1) what is the least restrictive environment which will provide the necessary safety for the individual and the community?; and 2) what services, available through the Court or in the community, should be put in place to address the individual's needs which were identified in the evaluation? On neglect matters, the purpose is to make recommendations about foster care placement and what elements should be included in a reunification plan. The Psychological Clinic staff is familiar with the continuum of services available for juveniles through the Family Division (for example probation, intensive probation, residential placement, and others), and with other placement or treatment options available through local or state-wide private and public agencies, and therefore can make recommendations that are practical and realistic.

To complete the above-mentioned evaluations, clinicians use a number of methods which include: review of records (court

file, school records, reports from prior psychological or psychiatric treatment, or records from other relevant prior interventions); gathering of third party information (usually interview of parents or foster parents and other collaterals); in-depth clinical interview; administration of psychological tests; consultation with other professionals (for example, juvenile detention staff, caseworker or treating therapist); and behavioral observations. Because the evaluation is court-ordered, the individuals being assessed are informed of the non-confidential nature of the evaluation.

Many different psychological tests can be used, which in juvenile cases generally fall into three categories: 1) tests of intellectual functioning, usually referred to as intelligence tests which yield an "IQ"; 2) achievement tests, which assess reading, spelling, math and related school-based tasks; and 3) personality tests, which assess the presence of mental illness and of personality characteristics. It should be noted that these tests do not yield "pass" or "fail" scores, but rather provide results which allow the examiner to compare the scores of one particular youth to a defined norm. The scores are in turn interpreted and described in terms of, for example, above or below average, or as signs of mental illness, or as a set of personality characteristics. The tests, or a combination of them, yield information about individuals' personality characteristics and about the ways that they are most likely to behave, to relate to other individuals, and to interact with their environment.

After the referred individual has been interviewed and tested, the tests have been scored and interpreted, and all relevant information has been collected, the evaluating psychologist's task is to prepare a report which integrates all this information. The psychological report should be organized in several parts and should contain information about: a) the referral question (why was this person evaluated?); b) the procedures used during the evaluation (where, when, how was the person evaluated?); c) the findings from the evaluation (what were the results?); and d) a summary of the findings which integrates the information (what does it all mean?), answers the referral question, and makes recommendations if appropriate.

Evaluators make efforts to avoid professional jargon in their reports and write documents which are easily understood by the referral source. The reports contain highly confidential, sensitive, and potentially upsetting material, and therefore the information contained in the reports needs to be carefully handled. The results of the evaluation have to be appropriately interpreted, preferably by the professional who conducted the evaluation, before they can be shared with the individual evaluated.

In the past few years, an increasing number of the youth who have become involved with the Court have had multiple problems, including severe emotional and psychiatric difficulties, severe school and learning problems, and are already taking one or more psychotropic medications. The complexity and the severity of the problems which have to be addressed present a challenge for the juvenile justice system, because the Court has to take into account complex mental health issues when making decisions about the disposition of a case. Therefore, more than ever, it is necessary to carefully evaluate these youngsters and their parents so that hearing officers, as well as Court caseworkers, have the information contained in the psychological reports to help them make important decisions.

COMMITMENT TO STAFF SAFETY: A GOAL AND AN OBLIGATION

by
Pamela S. Howitt, Ph.D.
Deputy Court Administrator, Family Division
Oakland County Circuit Court
Pontiac, Michigan

Probation program managers, judges, law enforcement command personnel, and other "executive types" can often be heard to express a variation on the cliché that "people are our most valuable resource." To be really meaningful, however, tangible actions must accompany these words. Management must be willing to fund program options and implement policies and procedures which demonstrate true commitment to employee safety and well-being. One such initiative recently completed in Oakland County, Michigan, is the Court Services Staff Safety Manual.

Our court employs over 100 people who are engaged in daily client contact in our office-based Psychological Clinic or in field offices as Juvenile Probation Officers or Youth Assistance Prevention workers. While Oakland County, Michigan, is a relatively affluent collection of suburban and quasi-rural communities, there are significant pockets of impoverishment and more densely populated core urban areas, including the county seat, the city of Pontiac. Predictably, the latter locations constitute the greater sources of referral to the court for delinquent activity and even organized gang activity, with accompanying greater risk to field staff. The issue of staff safety is considered by the court's administration to be one of significant importance, with county-wide relevance.

In March 1996, representatives from the three service units of the court began to meet regularly to address safety concerns. An employee of the county executive's Department of Risk Management also participated as a committee member and provided invaluable technical assistance. The committee had several objectives:

- 1) to raise management and staff awareness regarding safety and security issues;
- 2) to provide skill-building opportunities and training;
- 3) to examine the issue of personal safety equipment; and
- 4) to develop written safety procedures.

We began by surveying staff to determine attitudes and perceptions about safety on the job. Respondents expressed concerns about the increased level of potential violence among clients, the isolation of staff on home calls and in satellite offices, transportation of clients and other issues. Our next task was to collect information from juvenile courts and human service agencies in other locations. We found many common concerns, but few agencies with any written policies.

Nevertheless, from the materials we gathered, we were able to identify the most important topics for inclusion in a safety manual. A mission/philosophy statement was developed, along with policies on everything from handling obscene phone calls to dog bites. At one point, local community leaders became involved, when we established safety standards for satellite

office space provided as an in-kind contribution to our prevention programs.

We thoroughly researched personal safety devices such as chemical spray, and debated the pros and cons of making such equipment mandatory. While a small but vocal segment of our staff advocated for consideration of equipping probation officers with firearms, this was independently rejected by judges and court administration as unsuitable for our particular jurisdiction.

Ultimately, we settled on a requirement that all direct services staff be supplied with and trained in the proper use of pepper spray. In recognition of the fact that a growing number of security incidents actually occur within the confines of office locations, staff are expected to carry the canisters on their person, whether in the field or in the office. We successfully resolved a challenge from the employees' union regarding this policy (they initially objected to the mandatory provision). Finally, the committee assisted in developing two staff safety awareness trainings, and a third "how-to" training in personal self-defense, with plans to repeat this annually.

The Staff Safety Committee continues to meet quarterly to review any reports of threatening or dangerous field incidents and to refine policies and procedures as needed. Since the issuance of pepper spray to staff in January, 1998, one probation officer has actually discharged his canister in an incident (a dog attack), and there have been two other incidents in which the threat of its use was sufficient to resolve the situation. We believe these examples underscore both the timeliness and prudence of our policy decision.

We would be pleased to make available to interested readers copies of the manual's first edition and would welcome any suggestions for improvements. We would also be happy to provide additional information about the project to anyone seeking to replicate. For responsible field service managers, the protection of our personnel must be viewed not as an ideal or a goal, but as a virtual mandate.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

ACA AFFILIATE REPRESENTATIVE DESIGNATED

Robert L. Bingham, President of the National Association of Probation Executives, has designated **Melvin Brown, Jr.**, Director of the Montgomery County Department of Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Conroe, Texas, as the Association's representative to the American Correctional Association' Delegate Assembly.

Brown, who has devote close to three decades to the community corrections profession, is a past President of the Texas Probation Association and the Texas Corrections Association. Currently he is a member of the American Correctional Association's Commission on Accreditation for Corrections.

NAPE MEMBERS CONTRIBUTE TO CORRECTIONS MANAGEMENT QUARTERLY

In the winter 1999 issue of *Corrections Management Quarterly*, devoted to the subject of "Leadership in Corrections," may be found several articles written by members of the National Associa-

tion of Probation Executives. **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.**, of Massachusetts served as the Issue Editor and contributed an article as well.

Other Association members contributing articles included **Dan Richard Beto** of Texas, **Melvin Brown, Jr.**, of Texas, **Rocco A. Pozzi** of New York, and **Vincent Basile** of Massachusetts.

Corrections Management Quarterly is a peer-reviewed journal with a mission to provide executives and other key decision makers in the corrections field with strategic, timely, state-of-the-art information concerning the management of facilities and resources.

NEW DEAN NAMED AT SAM HOUSTON STATE UNIVERSITY

Richard H. Ward, Executive Director of the Office of International Criminal Justice at the University of Illinois at Chicago and an authority on international and domestic terrorism, has been named Dean of the College of Criminal Justice at Sam Houston State University. Ward will replace **Margaret Farnworth**, who has served as Acting Dean since July 1998, when then-Dean **Timothy J. Flanagan** left to become Vice President of Academic Affairs at the State University of New York at Brockport.

Ward began his criminal justice career with the New York City Police Department in 1962 as a patrol officer in Queens, where he also worked in the youth squad. He was promoted to detective in 1966 and worked in Brooklyn.

While working as a New York City police officer, Ward began his education, earning a bachelor's degree from the John Jay College of Criminal Justice at the City University of New York in 1968. In 1969 he was awarded a master's degree in criminology and two years later he earned a doctorate in criminology, both from the University of California at Berkeley.

In 1970 Ward joined the faculty at John Jay College of Criminal Justice and later served as Dean of Students; from 1975 to 1977 he served as Vice President. In 1997 he was named Vice Chancellor for Administration at the University of Illinois at Chicago, a position he held until 1993, when he was named Associate Chancellor for Special Programs and Professor of Criminal Justice. In January 1998 he assumed his current position, Executive Director of the Office of International Criminal Justice.

Ward is the author of numerous articles and books related to criminal investigation, terrorism, and police corruption. He has lectured extensively in more than 40 countries throughout the world on law enforcement administration and investigative methods. Ward was a visiting professor at the National Police College at Bramshill in England, the Egyptian Police Academy, and at the East China University of Politics and Law in Shanghai. He has lectured at the FBI Academy and has been a visiting lecturer on crime and the media in Columbia University's School of Journalism. In addition, he has served as a consultant to numerous police departments in the United States and to international law enforcement and criminal justice organizations.

David Payne, Vice President of Academic Affairs at Sam Houston State University, commented that "Dr. Ward is a distinguished scholar and practitioner who will bring strength and experience to the leadership of the College of Criminal Justice."

Ward was complimentary of the criminal justice program at Sam Houston State University. "I am looking forward to joining one of the most prestigious criminal justice programs in the world, with a long and distinguished history," Ward said. "My interest in international criminal justice issues and the opportunity to work more closely with educators and practitioners in

law enforcement and criminal justice were important considerations in my decision to take the position at Sam Houston State University."

Ward will assume his new position at Sam Houston State University shortly after the close of the Spring Semester.

NEW MEMBERS JOIN NAPE

Since the last issue of *Executive Exchange* was published, five new individual members joined the Association. They are as follows:

Robert E. Bittner, Director, Somerset County Probation and Youth Services, 212 East Main Street, Somerset, Pennsylvania 15501.

Kit San Groteleuschen, Parole/Probation Supervisor, Michigan Department of Corrections, P.O. Box 27252, Lansing, Michigan 48909.

Marge Marchlewicz, Court Administrator, Bay County Probate Court, 1230 Washington Avenue, Suite 715, Bay City, Michigan 48708.

Edward E. Rhine, Jr., Chair, Release Authority, Ohio Department of Youth Services, 51 North High Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

Leonard Simpson, Assistant Chief Probation Officer, Marion County Superior Court Probation Department, 200 East Washington Street, Suite T322, Indianapolis, Indiana 46204.

In addition to the new individual members, the Association realized two new organizational members; they are as follows: **Bell-Lampasas Counties Community Supervision and Corrections Department**, P. O. Box 294, Belton, Texas 76513.

Volunteers in Prevention, Probation, and Prisons, Inc., 163 Madison Avenue, Suite 207, Detroit, Michigan 48226.

NAPE TO HOLD ANNUAL EVENTS IN NEW YORK WITH THE APPA ANNUAL INSTITUTE

In conjunction with the 24th Annual Institute of the American Probation and Parole Association scheduled to be held in New York City on August 22-25, 1999, the National Association of Probation Executives will hold several events at the Marriott Marquee. The NAPE events are as follows:

Members Reception
Saturday, August 21, 1999
4:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

Annual Awards Breakfast
Sunday, August 22, 1999
8:30 a.m. - 10:30 a.m.

Annual Board of Directors Meeting
Sunday, August 22, 1999
10:30 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.

Additional information about the NAPE events will be forthcoming. Make plans to attend Association activities.

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