

National Association of Probation Executives EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

ISSN 1075-2234

WINTER 2001

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Greetings! By the time you receive this issue of *Executive Exchange*, I hope the harsh winter weather is a thing of the past and that you are now enjoying the vestiges of spring.

intake process; reporting requirements; availability of probation staff; office hours; and transportation.

We are grateful to Bob for putting this issue together.

This Issue

Board Member Bob Czaplicki, Commissioner of Probation for Onondaga County in Syracuse, New York, serves as this issue's Guest Editor and offers readers a number of articles that should stimulate thought.

In the first article, "Broken Windows and Diversity," Bob and Mary Winter discuss Onondaga County's efforts to implement the "broken windows" model of probation and, concurrently, renew efforts to increase staff diversity. Bob and Mary contribute a second article as well, this one dealing with a new focus by their department to address the needs of juveniles referred for services.

Developing the offender workforce is the subject of an article submitted by Mike Richmond and Shelly Morelock, in which they describe a number of programs in the Sixth Judicial District Department of Correctional Services in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, to improve the marketability of offenders under supervision.

The final article is contributed by Gene Bonham, a former Chief Probation Officer who is now in pursuit of a doctoral degree in criminal justice, and three coauthors, who explore the attitudes of adult offenders and program responsiveness in a three county jurisdiction in Kansas. The findings presented in this article were gleaned from a survey which examined offender attitudes in the following areas: relationship with supervising probation officer; nature and accessibility of services provided by the agency;



Executive Development Program

On March 4-9, 2001, another Executive Development Program for new probation and parole executives was conducted in Huntsville, Texas. This program, which has been held twice annually since 1997, is a collaborative initiative of the National Institute of Corrections, National Association of Probation Executives, and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University. It is truly a cooperative effort in that NIC provides the financial support, NAPE supplies the faculty, and CMIT provides logistical support and a learning environment. During this most recent program members of the peer faculty included George Alexander of New York, Bernard Fitzgerald of Massachusetts, Ron Goethals of Texas, and Diane McGinnis of Arizona.

Since its inception, well over 100 probation and parole executives have successfully completed this program. In addition, they have been introduced to the NAPE network and many have become active in the organization.

The next Executive Development Program is scheduled for September 23-28, 2001. If you know of any new Chief Probation Officers in your area who might benefit from this learning experience, please let us know.

Reinventing Probation Movement

It appears that the reinventing probation movement is catching on throughout the country, as evidenced by the

CONTENTS

President's Message	1
Broken Windows and Diversity, E. Robert Czaplicki and Mary C. Winter	3
A New Juvenile Justice Vision, E. Robert Czaplicki and Mary C. Winter	4
Jobs to Careers – Developing the Offender Workforce, Mike Richmond and Shelly Morelock	6
Survey of Offender Attitudes and Program Responsiveness in Kansas Gene Bonham, Jr.; Rodney J. Henningsen, Ph.D.; Dan Richard Beto; and Galan M. Janeksela, Ph.D.	9
News From the Field	16

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE (cont'd)

inquiries received at the NAPE secretariat offices for information about the "broken windows" model. In addition, annual reports received from a number of community corrections agencies are beginning to stress some of the key strategies found in *Transforming Probation through Leadership: The "Broken Windows" Model*.

Our thanks go out to Ron Corbett, John DiIulio, and Henry Olsen for the leadership they have provided to this project. This is truly an exciting time for our profession.

NAPE Events at APPA

While you will be receiving more information about this in a few months from now, may this serve as a reminder for you to mark your calendars for the NAPE events held in conjunction with the 26th Annual Training Institute of

the American Probation and Parole Association scheduled for August 26-29, 2001, in St. Paul, Minnesota.

On the afternoon of Saturday, August 25, 2001, NAPE will hold its annual member's reception, and on Sunday, August 26, 2001, the annual awards breakfast will be held, during which we will honor the "Probation Executive of the Year" with the presentation of the Sam Houston State University Award. For over a decade NAPE and Sam Houston State University have recognized a deserving community corrections administrator for distinguished service to the profession.

See you in St. Paul!

Dan Richard Beto
President

INFORMATION ABOUT EXECUTIVE EXCHANGE

Executive Exchange, the quarterly journal of the National Association of Probation Executives (NAPE), publishes articles, reports, book reviews, commentaries, and news items of interest to community corrections administrators. In keeping with the ethical standards of NAPE, the contents of articles or other materials contained in *Executive Exchange* do not reflect the endorsements, official attitudes, or positions of the Association 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 photo-

graph 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 (936) 294-1675. Facsimiles may be sent to (936) 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 George J. Beto 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.

BROKEN WINDOWS AND DIVERSITY

by

E. Robert Czaplicki
Commissioner of Probation
and

Mary C. Winter
Principal Probation Officer
Onondaga County Probation Department
Syracuse, New York

The last year of the millennium, 1999, was the year the Onondaga County Probation Department began to take the first steps to implement the "broken windows" model. It was an opportune time to simultaneously renew efforts to increase the diversity of our staff. Lack of diversity in staffing has long been a concern for our Department. Our upstate New York community of 456,219 has a probation caseload with a minority census of 40%. In 1999 our percentage of minority Probation Officers was 7%.

Coincidentally, a series of meetings were ongoing with numerous community leaders to combat rising gang and gun violence in the City of Syracuse. The Commissioner of Probation spearheaded this effort and enlisted the support of the County Executive, Mayor of the City of Syracuse, and District Attorney. Discussions about how best to reach youth ensued with a variety of community leaders particularly the faith community. A clear message was received: "We want you to hire Probation Officers who look like us."

We totally agreed. We knew the value of Probation Officers who understood and empathized with the experience of young men and women growing up in the inner city. Also, it was critical to reverse a traditional lack of trust with law enforcement and work to break down barriers between these groups. The challenge remained formidable. Years of attempting to increase our diversity proved unproductive, as an antiquated civil service system did not test for skills needed for work in a modern Probation Department. For example, white middle class, middle aged women always scored at the top of the list on this exam which emphasized language skills. Men and minorities did not perform as well. In addition, interest in a career as a Probation Officer was so strong that many people took the test. Minorities could never be reached due to their position on the civil service list.

Attempts to change the selection process by conducting oral exams were rejected as too costly or unworkable. Finally a solution appeared. A long forgotten civil service title of Probation Officer (Minority Group Specialist) was discovered. Support from the Office of the County Executive, over the next few months, resulted in every vacant Probation Officer position being converted to Probation Officer (Minority Group Specialist).

To accomplish this meant an appearance at the County Legislature who by law must approve job title changes. Initially there was some concern we were subverting the civil service system, but eventually there was understanding that hiring minority Probation Officers to increase our success with minority probationers was good practice.

When seven positions were available, a recruitment effort commenced. Since the exam would not be given for months, we were free to hire provisional staff prior to testing.

A current minority Probation Officer recognized as a community leader was invaluable in recruiting experienced individuals currently employed in human services. There were no compromises on qualifications. Applicants for the new positions were required to possess the same academic and experience credentials as all other Probation Officers. Job duties were the same with the exception that the new officers would work in high crime city neighborhoods with both minority and majority probationers.

To conform with customary practice for all Probation Officer candidates, informational sessions were conducted to explain job requirements such as required firearm carrying and night and weekend home visits. A crucial part of this meeting was having a current minority Probation Officer discuss life as a minority Probation Officer with minority probationers, what is like to live in the same neighborhood as her probationers, and how the work of probation, with a bent toward community protection, differed from the applicant's current human service work.

We are proud that seven new minority officers are now working in the Probation Department. Minority Officers now comprise 16% of the staff. These minority probation officers are involved in their community by volunteering in youth groups, churches, schools and sports activities. As a result of their community involvement coupled with past employment, they already know many of their probationers and their family dynamics. This knowledge enables the Probation Officers to cut directly to the real issues with their clients and make plans to address them. The minority officers' knowledge of gangs, their members, colors and language enhances the chance of a successful intervention. A major benefit will be an increase in the cultural competency of our entire staff.

In conclusion, we intend to continue our commitment to diversity by converting future vacant Probation Officer positions to Minority Group Specialist. This activity is integral to implementation of the "Broken Windows Model" in Onondaga County.

A NEW JUVENILE JUSTICE VISION IN ONONDAGA COUNTY

by

E. Robert Czaplicki
Commissioner of Probation
and
Mary C. Winter
Principal Probation Officer
Onondaga County Probation Department
Syracuse, New York

"Keep serious juvenile delinquent (JD) and persons in need of supervision (PINS) youth home and treat and supervise them in their own communities. Avoid formal placement whenever possible."

These themes are now familiar in Onondaga County's rapidly changing world of juvenile justice. In 1995 the theme resulted in a positive paradigm shift for a group of troubled as well as troubling youth in our upstate New York community of 450,000. In the early 1990s the number of youth placed as juvenile delinquents and persons in need of supervision was on the rise. In New York State the law dictates that delinquent and ungovernable youth under the age of 16 be handled in Family Court except for very serious crimes when they may be charged as adults. Youth may be placed in juvenile institutions costing between \$50,000 and \$120,000 per year. By 1995 the cost of these placements was projected at over 8 million dollars with only 6 million budgeted for payments. A crisis was clearly emerging.

The Onondaga County Executive appealed to the Commissioner of Probation to assist the Department of Social Services in solving this problem. At the time the Department of Social Services was responsible for placing the youth after referrals from the Probation Department. Most referred youth were routinely placed and there was only one small alternative to placement program.

A task force that came to be called the JD/PINS steering committee was convened to attack the problem on a variety of fronts. Members of the task force included county officials and representatives of community agencies. Judges and school officials were intentionally not invited initially because their interests were not necessarily that of County government. A preliminary question was to determine the return we were receiving on our placement investment. A quick study was completed on all JD/PINS youth placed in 1991 which revealed that most were in trouble again after returning from placement. We decided outcomes could improve by treating and supervising youth in our own community while saving a great deal of money in the process.

Project PRISM (Probation Rehabilitation Intensive Services and Management) was established as the first major alternative to placement. PRISM is an intensive case management program modeled after the Intensive Case Management programs that saved millions of dollars by treating mental health clients in their own homes and communities. A unique aspect of the PRISM program is the involvement of public/private collaborative partners: Onondaga County Departments of Probation

and Social Services and a not for profit agency, the Salvation Army. Initially two teams of three staff each were responsible for 30 JD/PINS children. Each team was comprised of a Probation Officer, DSS caseworker and a Salvation Army case manager. The program is located at the Salvation Army.

Initial cases were selected from those already involved in placement planning:

- Juvenile delinquents (JD) and youth adjudicated as persons in need of supervision (PINS) who have violated their probation and are in imminent danger of placement.
- JD and PINS youth who would have been referred for placement after the completion of the probation social investigation.
- JD and PINS youth who are currently in placement and could be safely returned to the community under the intensive supervision and support of the program.

This process utilized a Placement Review Board which continues to meet twice weekly to seek alternatives for all placement bound JD and PINS youth.

Along with intensive case management the program includes aggression reduction/anger management groups life skills training and drug and alcohol counseling. Families are encouraged to attend a weekly parent group. Home based work is also central to assist parents in helping their children. Recreational activities vary from a yearly overnight camping trip to participation in a charity bike-a-thon fundraiser. Most youth perform community service. Staff provides 24 hour, 7 day per week coverage for crisis and emergencies.

Within a year the PRISM program was so successful in improving outcomes for youth and saving money that it was decided to double the number of staff and youth served. Funds not spent on placement totals over 10 million dollars.

In November 1998 the Probation Department and the Salvation Army received the Mutual of America Community Partnership Award. The award recognizes leadership in public, private and social sectors who have formed partnerships for the greater good of their community.

As a result of our proven and outstanding track record the Onondaga County Probation Department was selected for participation in two exciting demonstration projects. The New York State Division of Criminal Justice Services chose Onondaga County as one of three sites in the state to test the efficacy of electronic monitoring for juvenile delinquents who would otherwise be placed. So far 46 juveniles have been involved with the program with only 11 placed.

In addition the New York State Office of Children and Family Services selected Onondaga County Probation as one of three (the only site outside of New York City) to participate in a demonstration project to test the use of Multi-Systemic Therapy as both an alternative to placement and as an early release from placement. The program has been deemed a "best practice" by the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. A family preservation model is used with caseloads of five or six families and staff providing home based services at times convenient to the family. Staff are available 24 hours, 7 days a week. So far 25 youth have been treated with only 4 placed.

Additionally, a program to supervise pre-adjudicated youth has stabilized our detention center population and reduced the non-secure detention population by 25%.

Our newest program, ECHO (Envisioning Change and Healthy Options) targets primarily JD/PINS girls who are "running the streets" and would be placed due to very high risk behaviors such as serious substance abuse, running away and dangerous sexual activity. Clinicians work intensively in a home based service.

In cases where a youth represents a serious threat to the community and we are unable to ameliorate that threat, youth are placed according to the following policy:

- Be placed for the shortest time necessary.
- Be returned when appropriate to aftercare through an intensive case management program.
- Be placed at the lowest possible cost.

To improve coordination of all juvenile justice programs the Probation Department is now responsible for placement of JD/PINS youth.

In conclusion our efforts to reduce out of home placements are extremely successful. On January 1, 1996 there were 175 JD/PINS youth placed. On January 1, 2001 there were 50, a reduction of 71%.

We are proud that successful strategies employed in the reengineering of our juvenile justice system include strong support from the top leaders in County government, collaboration with community partners, and staff with a caring passion for the work.



On September 23-28, 2001, the National Institute of Corrections, working in concert with the National Association of Probation Executives and the Correctional Management Institute of Texas at Sam Houston State University, will again offer its highly-acclaimed Executive Development Program for newly-appointed probation and parole executives.

This program offers newly-appointed chief executive officers in probation and parole relevant management training and an introduction into various networks. This weeklong training experience is provided at no cost to the participant.

NAPE members who are aware of new probation executives are encouraged to contact **J. Richard Faulkner, Jr.**, Community Corrections Specialist at the National Institute of Corrections.

He may be reached at (202) 514-0100.

FROM JOB TO CAREER – DEVELOPING THE OFFENDER WORKFORCE IN THE SIXTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF IOWA

by

Mike Richmond
Division Manager
and

Shelly Morelock
Community Treatment Coordinator
Sixth Judicial District Department of Correctional Services
Cedar Rapids, Iowa

Preface

I remember supervising a work release center in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, in the late 1970s. Employment was not easy to come by but the offenders were highly motivated – get a job within two weeks' time or go back to prison. Aside from providing them with the local newspaper and the address of Job Services, little else was done to help these offenders obtain any kind of employment. Occasionally we would assist with some job leads and if the offender needed inexpensive items of equipment, clothing, or the first month's union dues, we had a loan fund to help out. Vocational Rehabilitation was sometimes available for those offenders who were eligible. But we didn't have the staff and it wasn't a priority. Some offenders got decent jobs in spite of it. Most didn't. After they got a job, our only follow-up was to speak to the employer to confirm the employment and then do monthly job checks to see how the offender was doing. It was no surprise that, as soon as they could get away with it, the offenders would quit their jobs. Parole and probation services were much the same. One thing we did know was if an offender managed to obtain a job which was meaningful and paid reasonably well – as opposed to a minimum wage dishwashing job – that offender was less likely to fail our work release program and was usually successful on parole. This was all anecdotal, however, as no real statistics were kept nor research done in those days. I do remember a work release resident with a criminal record of hefty proportions and many failures. He managed to get a job as a union laborer with our help and soon found himself employed on a construction job making a good hourly wage. He saved his money for the four months he was on work release and when he finally received his parole he was able to pay cash for a decent car. I will never forget his comment to me when he drove up to the halfway house to proudly show off his car. He told me it was the first car he had ever had that he hadn't stolen and that it felt great to be able to drive a nice car without having to worry about getting arrested. That was more than twenty years ago. He's still out as of the last time I talked to him.

The first small steps to address offender employment taken by our community-based corrections department happened in the late 1980s. We hired job developers. They at least specialized in working with offenders who had employment needs, but they were overwhelmed with the sheer volume. The concept was good but in practice the job developers did little more than become the point of contact for employers. One job developer who worked in field services was able to do some assessments and referrals, but she could only work with a few offenders out

of the hundreds who could have benefitted from her time and expertise.

Program Development

The Sixth Judicial District Department of Correctional Services in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, operates under a Board of Directors consisting of representatives of the courts, the bar, the community, county boards of supervisors, and the chairs of Advisory Committees that are formed by the board to direct specified tasks. In December 1996, the Southern Advisory Committee of our department decided to consider the implementation of an employment continuum for offenders under our supervision. The committee was supportive of the concept and recruited some additional experts to join the committee for input. These included Kirkwood Community College staff and a private employment agency representative. In February 1997, the Southern Advisory Committee met again and discussed the concept of an education/employment continuum for offenders with emphasis on the problem of developing potential workers, our offenders, as "knowledge based workers." By June 1997, the Southern Advisory Committee was in a position to tackle the workforce issue in a meaningful way. Representatives from Kirkwood Community College were in attendance as well as from Iowa Workforce Development, private employers, and area educators. At that meeting, the Southern Advisory Committee decided to work on looking at client data, resources available, developing a model for a continuum, and identifying advocate/support persons.

In August 1997, the committee met and, with the assistance of representatives from the Iowa Workforce Development Center, Kirkwood Community College, J.T.P.A. and Vocational Rehabilitation, began to finalize the concept of an education employment continuum. This would include a plan for each offender, based on a supervision period of eighteen months, which would include assessment, referral, retention, other issues, and follow up. A pilot program was announced at the October 1997 meeting of the committee where job developers in the two residential facilities in Cedar Rapids would work with the treatment unit of the department to promote the employment possibilities for offenders. This resulted in the Residential Employment Awareness Program (REAP).

The Southern Advisory Committee tracked the progress of the pilot REAP project in subsequent meetings and offered support and expertise in working out the details of this new project.

The National Institute of Corrections became involved as a training resource for job developers and community partners and several were sent to Longmont, Colorado, for technical assistance and training in forming community partnerships and job development. Besides sending our staff and community partners to Colorado, the National Institute of Corrections provided the Department of Correctional Services with a technical assistance workshop in March 1998. Eric Seleznow and Steven Epting came to Cedar Rapids and, working with our staff and community partners, conducted a workshop on "Offender Employment and Training" which demonstrated best practices for offender training and employment and building community collaborations.

The committee continued to monitor progress as the Department of Correctional Services moved toward a more proactive approach to workforce development for offenders. It was noted in a meeting in October 1998 that not only was REAP showing success but also other activities within the department were being generated with the committee's support under the general heading of "Productive Opportunities." By the February 1999 meeting of the committee, it was determined that their work with the workforce process in the department was done and they were ready to move into the areas of community and restorative justice.

During the time the Southern Advisory Committee was active in workforce issues, the following programs began and blossomed within the Department of Correctional Services and are now active, effective programs targeting offenders in positive ways.

REAP has been developed primarily in our residential facilities but offers selected parolees or probationers the opportunity to participate. This program began in late 1997. It includes an initial assessment and orientation. The offenders then attend a job readiness class at Kirkwood Community College where they are further assessed for interests, skills, and abilities. Professionals at the community college also tackle resume development, and the development of a career plan. The third phase includes the offenders attending life skills and job retention classes. Finally, the offender meets with a job developer in the Department of Correctional Services where they discuss goals both long and short term, review job possibilities that fit into their career plans, sign up for Work Force Development and JTPA, and actually begin the job search. This program takes one week to complete and all offenders in the residential program who are unemployed or underemployed are enrolled with the primary goal of assisting the offender to attain meaningful employment.

As of June 2000, more than 450 offenders had participated in this program. Exit surveys done with all offenders who successfully graduate from the residential component indicate that this program is one of the most popular we offer due mainly to that fact that it is presented by non-correctional staff in a college environment and provides useful tools for the offender in areas other than the traditional treatment venues of substance abuse counseling, etc.

Community Service in the context of workforce development includes selected offenders being involved in the completion of short-term work on specific projects in the community. Beyond the restorative aspect of the offender being able to give back something to the community, these projects involve skill development through service learning.

Some community service projects have involved landscaping, playground building, tree planting, painting, and building assistive devices for children with disabilities (in partnership with engineers from a local firm which specializes in aeronautic equipment). The offender can benefit from community service by acquiring skills through service learning and can fulfill legal obligations for such service at the same time. However, one of the more important aspects of these short-term projects is the introduction of the offender to prosocial partners with whom they perform much of their community service tasks. Working as partners with members of the community to complete a project is rewarding from any aspect as the community begins to view offenders from a positive standpoint and offenders develop positive relationships with prosocial people.

Breakfast Club is a group of parole and probation offenders who meet at 8:00 AM three mornings per week at the corrections campus under the supervision of parole and probation officers and Community Treatment Coordinators. These offenders are referred by their supervising agents and are either unemployed or underemployed. The purpose of the breakfast club is to work with the offender to develop strategies for finding employment. Coaching and accountability are an integral part of this program. The offender meets each morning with staff who assure the offender is properly dressed, organized and motivated to seek employment that day. The offender is required to return at 3:00 PM each day and turn in their job contact sheet with six contacts documented. This program continues until the offender obtains employment. If an offender decides they want more assistance in finding meaningful employment they are referred to REAP. This program has resulted in a better than 90% success rate at motivating offenders to seek, find, and take employment.

Mentoring in the context of a workforce advocate is a program that the Southern Advisory Committee had recommended. The Department of Correctional Services is developing a mentoring program designed to assist offenders who need extra support and coaching in both job seeking and retention. A number of community members of diverse backgrounds have been recruited to be role models, to encourage and to coach the offender who is experiencing difficulties getting or keeping employment. Presently, this is a program that is voluntary on the part of the offender who must express a willingness and desire for such extra assistance.

LLEARN (Long Lasting Earning and Retention Network) is the Coralville employment project that began in January 2000 after a year of research and planning. Coralville is one of the Sixth Judicial District's Department of Correctional Service's regional offices where a probation office and residential facility are co-located. In keeping with the philosophy of the district this program is intended to match offenders with meaningful employment opportunities, improve retention, increase prosocial relationships, while teaching offenders how to set goals and begin to achieve those goals.

This project includes the development of a database of offender employment and skill levels, a computerized interest and aptitude assessment, computer interactive life skills coursework, individual counseling, and job retention activities through a Job Club. A computer lab has been installed where offenders take their individual assessments, participate in the life skills curriculum, work on their resumes, and

use specific Internet websites for the job search and career planning.

Specific programming needs are determined through assessment and staffing (in which the offender is an active participant). In addition to the interest and aptitude assessment there are a battery of pre and post program assessments used that look at on the job relationships, attitudes, social skills, cognitive beliefs in relation to career planning, and employment satisfaction. It is the hope that we will see changes in these areas, improvements in the LSI-R category scores, and improved employment retention through this initiative.

Future initiatives for the Coralville project include developing workplace mentor training and continuing to improve our follow-up support of our employer partners.

Community Partners is a concept in the beginning stages. The Department of Correctional Services is intent on developing partnerships with other agencies and employers in order to provide workforce where needed and coordinate the treatment activities of the offender population under supervision within the context of workforce development. The Department of Correctional Services has been seeking opportunities to provide workers for private industry and has worked in innovative ways with private industry to the mutual benefit of the offender and the business. On one occasion, a company in Cedar Rapids was able to contract with selected residential offenders to perform piecemeal work at the residential facility on weekends and evenings. The residents benefited from the skills and pay they received and the company was able to benefit by getting caught up in their work product they were obligated to provide to other vendors. An agreement was reached with this employer that they would give weighted consideration for full time employment to those offenders who worked well in this process and, if hired, would be considered for a higher rate of pay than a normal entry level worker.

Two open house/job fairs were held at the community-based facilities in 1999 and 2000. These fairs were organized and coordinated by residential staff and were considered to be successful. The idea sprang from a suggestion made by The National Institute of Corrections where some of our staff had been sent for training in workforce development.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the Department of Correctional Services in the Sixth Judicial District in Iowa has made major strides to develop a workforce of offenders properly assessed and prepared not only to get a job, but also to obtain meaningful employment with a career path. Our Southern Advisory committee has played a key role in this endeavor as they coached and coaxed various programs, over the space of two years from conception to completion. An offender who has a job with a decent wage, with a future potential and matched to the offenders' skills and interest contributes much to the eventual success of that offender, therefore reducing the risk of recidivism.

By introducing offenders into pro-social environments through such projects as Community Service, helping them develop their career potentials, and doing "what works" with our offenders in a restorative justice environment we all win.


APPAS
 26th Annual Training Institute
 August 26-29, 2001 • • • Saint Paul, Minnesota
**Charting the Course
 for Community Justice:**
 Realistic, Relevant and Restorative

Ever feel like you need a compass to find your way out of the jungle of ever-changing challenges, conflicting demands and new programs that really work? Let APPA's 26th Annual Training Institute serve as your guide to maneuver through the options, tools and programs available to community justice professionals. Over 80 workshops will provide answers to today's issues in probation, parole and community corrections. Start charting your course now to participate in this exceptional event designed for the challenging world of community justice.

- **Learn** fresh, new ideas from well-known, national experts.
- **Experience** innovative programming from all across the nation.
- **Participate** in stimulating discussions with your peers.
- **Discover** "what works" from professionals in the field.
- **Network** with your peers and learn from their diverse experience.
- **View and compare** the newest correctional products and technologies.
- **Take part** in exciting and fun social events.



For registration information, 
Mail: P.O. Box 11910,
 Lexington, KY 40578
Phone: (859) 244-8204
Fax: (859) 244-8001
Email: APPA@csg.org
Online: www.appa-net.org

SURVEY OF OFFENDER ATTITUDES AND PROGRAM RESPONSIVENESS IN KANSAS

by

Gene Bonham, Jr.
 Doctoral Fellow
 College of Criminal Justice
 Sam Houston State University
 Huntsville, Texas

Rodney J. Henningsen, Ph.D.
 Associate Professor
 College of Criminal Justice
 Sam Houston State University
 Huntsville, Texas

Dan Richard Beto
 Director
 Correctional Management Institute of Texas
 Sam Houston State University
 Huntsville, Texas

Galan M. Janeksela, Ph.D.
 Dean, College of Health and Human Services
 University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
 Chattanooga, Tennessee

Introduction

A major goal of probation in the United States is to promote public safety and thereby reduce the risk of recidivism. In order to implement this goal while also reducing prohibitively high costs of incarceration, legislative bodies are increasingly utilizing community-based programs. These programs are designed to provide structure and control, while also supporting rehabilitative efforts. This balanced approach to supervising probationers which maintains control of the offender while making resources available to address rehabilitative needs is presumed to contribute most effectively to sound supervision. At the same time, along with increasing the use of community corrections, legislators also demand more accountability from these community-based agencies and will increasingly only fund those programs that can demonstrate positive outcomes, i.e., reduced recidivism. Thus, it has become incumbent upon community-based probation agencies to not only clearly identify their mission and goals, but also to demonstrate in measurable terms their performance outcomes related to the offenders they serve.

Research has shown that effective treatment interventions with adult offenders address specific risk factors associated with offenders, criminogenic needs of offenders, and certain responsivity issues related to services provided. Targeting offender dynamic risk factors for change is very important in the overall strategy designed to reduce risk of recidivism. Equally important is the targeting of criminogenic needs of offenders through treatment interventions that lower the potential for future criminal behavior. Finally, responsivity issues must be addressed. "The principle of responsivity simply states that treatment programs should be delivered in a manner that facili-

tates the learning of new pro-social skills by the offender" (Gendreau, 1993).

This study occurs within the broader context of a growing body of research that demonstrates that certain principles can be associated with effective intervention of offenders. From the time Martinson et al. (1974) suggested "nothing works" in the rehabilitation of offenders, subsequent research accords a more optimistic view of rehabilitation programs. The purposes here are to (1) highlight selected studies which provide the conceptual framework within which the current study occurs, and (2) examine the scant literature that exists on probation agencies utilizing offender feedback designed to maximize program effectiveness and ultimately enhance the reduction of offender recidivism.

Review of Selected Studies

The fact that rehabilitation efforts have a positive effect on offenders has been supported in a variety of research efforts since the middle 1970's. Meta-analytic techniques have been employed by a number of researchers to more objectively assess the various research efforts completed. Numerous offender treatment literature reviews are available describing research results in this area (Gendreau, 1996). One such study examined over 443 treatment programs and found that 64% of these programs reported an average reduction in recidivism of 10% (Lipsey, 1992). Other researchers in this area have focused upon developing a paradigm of effective and ineffective interventions. These researchers hypothesize that when programs that provide services to offenders follow effective principles of intervention, reduction in offender recidivism should follow. One such analysis found that programs using many of the characteristics of effective interven-

tion did indeed reduce recidivism 25% to 80%, or on average of about 50% (Andrews, Zinger, Hoge, Bonta, Gendreau, and Cullen 1990). This represents a significant reduction.

The implications of such studies for community corrections programs are immense. Under pressure from both legislative bodies and the public to demonstrate their effectiveness (frequently defined as a reduction in recidivism), community corrections programs need to incorporate sound research findings into their overall management strategy in dealing with the offenders they serve. In order to effectively reduce recidivism and enhance public safety, correctional managers must reassess and redesign their programs, and, when necessary, build in effective principles of intervention.

Few studies have been done that view the offender on probation as an important stakeholder in the criminal justice system, i.e., a "customer" whose ideas and feedback are important or helpful. Those that could be found are reviewed here with a focus upon both subject matter and methodologies/measures employed.

One of the earlier studies attempted to involve probationers in the debate about the mission and strategy of probation (Allen, 1985). A sample of 87 federal probationers participated in semi-structured personal interviews shortly after they completed probation to determine their perceptions about probation in terms of selected perspectives, such as rehabilitation, deterrence, desert, and justice models. An important conclusion made by the author was that "offenders are willing to provide input and they have something to say" (Allen, 1985).

Offender perceptions of fines and restitution imposed on them were analyzed on a sample of 82 probationers who were scheduled for termination of probation between March 1, 1992 and September 30, 1992 (Allen and Treger, 1994). Suggestions from probationers concerning fines and restitution were sought in this study, and the authors concluded, "offenders perceptions of correctional programs are needed to make useful program modification" (Allen and Treger, 1994).

Research has also affirmed the critical importance of the relationship between the probationer and the supervising probation officer. This was examined in a study completed by Gibbs (1985). In his research, which was based on tape-recorded interviews with over 50 men and women sentenced to probation (Gibbs, 1985), he sought to elicit the clients' views of the probation officer, probation rules, and the purpose of probation. Those interviewed expressed several major concerns or needs, which included: (1) a need for support (30% of the respondents), as well as understanding, and empathy; (2) a need for autonomy (25%) defined as a need to be in control of one's life with minimal restraint; (3) a need for flexibility (about 20%) and adaptability of the probation officer; (4) a need for assistance (13%) or aid in dealing with concrete problems; and (5) and finally, and very interestingly, a need for control or external regulation of their lives (a mere 11%). Being able to assess offender needs allows the probation agency to better match offenders with the probation officer whose supervision style best responds to those needs.

The importance of the probation officer/offender relationship was also documented in a study that took place in New Zealand. There, as in the United States, a major goal of community corrections is to "contribute to a reduction in the likelihood of reoffending" (Leibrich, 1994). The subjects of this study were a random sample of forty-eight offenders who had been on probation for three years; and who had no convictions for criminal or major traffic offenses during their probation. Semi-structured interviews were conducted on this sample. Probably the most significant finding in this study

was that those probationers who thought they benefited from probation related a positive feeling toward their probation officer (Leibrich, 1994).

Interview techniques were also used in a very unique study which sought to test the conventional wisdom that offenders, like others in society, see probation as less punitive than incarceration and will therefore choose it, if that option is made available. Offender preference for serving time in prison rather than a probation sentence was examined in a study of 1,027 male felons in Texas who had been sentenced to incarceration (Crouch, 1993). Trained graduate students from Sam Houston State University conducted interviews with the sample of inmates. Two thirds of those interviewed stated they would choose one year in prison over ten years on probation; almost one-half would have chosen one year in prison over five years on probation; and nearly one-third preferred one year in prison as opposed to three years on probation (Crouch, 1993).

The use of survey questionnaires has also been used as a means of obtaining probationer feedback about programs and services. One such study polled 255 standard adult probationers for their views on various issues related to the overall management of the probation department (Bingham, 1994). The author discusses the initial resistance of staff to the prospect of giving clients the opportunity to evaluate the services they received. The fear was that the clients would be very negative and staff might be penalized in some way. This was not borne out, however, as the narrative responses from probationers were rated as 59% positive, 28% neutral, and only 14% negative. It was concluded that such surveys should be conducted annually or biannually as a means of regular evaluation of the agency's programs and services.

A similar survey questionnaire was also used in Walker County, Texas to seek the views of adults on misdemeanor and felony probation about their experience under supervision (Henningesen, Beto, Ross, and Bachrach, 1996). In addition to demographic variables, the survey examined the probationer's view of his/her probation officer and services provided by the agency. This type of assessment, from the point of view of the probationer is seen to have "extensive possibilities for practical use, including planning for future probation service delivery, agency staffing practices, budget preparation, staff training, etc." (Henningesen et al., 1996). This particular study serves as the impetus for the current research that looks at a population of community corrections offenders in Kansas.

Methods

The target group for the study was 104 adult offenders who were sentenced to community corrections supervision in the Sixth Judicial District in Kansas. Of these 104 offenders, seventy-eight were ultimately available to be surveyed, see Table 1 for demographic summary. The remaining offenders were not available due to a variety of reasons. These reasons include: (1) the offender was in jail on new charges or technical violations of probation, (2) the offender was an absconder whose whereabouts were unknown, or (3) the offender had moved and had been transferred to another jurisdiction during the study. To assure some degree of familiarity with the program and staff, selected offenders were required to have been under supervision for a minimum of sixty days. The Sixth Judicial District is composed of three rural counties along the eastern Kansas/Missouri border and represents one of thirty-two community corrections programs in the state of Kansas.

Table 1. Profile of Survey Participants

Demographic Variable	Survey Sample (N = 78)			
Gender	Marital Status			
	Male	76%	Married	29%
	Female	24%	Single	47%
Race/Ethnicity	Divorced			19%
	White	81%	Separated	3%
	Black	10%	Widowed	1%
Native American	Highest Grade of School			
	Hispanic	5%	Some College/College	
	Other	3%	Graduate	23%
Age	High School Graduate			24%
	17-25 years	38%	Some High School	46%
	26-30 years	15%	Less than 8th Grade	7%
	31-45 years	40%		
	45+	6%		

The survey used was a modified version of the one developed by Henningesen et al. in 1996 on a population of Texas probation offenders. As used in the current study, the survey questionnaire was designed to examine how probationers perceived both their supervising officer, as well as the services provided by the program. Sixty-nine questions were divided amongst a number of general topical areas. These included the probation intake process, reporting procedures, availability of program staff, office hours, transportation issues, responsiveness of the supervising officer, and several-service related categories.

The surveys were given to the offender when they reported with instructions provided by community corrections staff. Participants were assured that participation was voluntary and special care was taken to assure the respondents that confidentiality would be protected. When the offender completed the surveys, they were given to staff who forwarded them to the researchers.

Results

Intake Process

The probation process begins with the intake of the new probationers. It is a most critical stage that often sets the tone of the remaining time the clients serve on probation. Successful supervision begins with probation officers who exhibit excellent interpersonal skills — people who are sensitive and responsive to others while at the same time attentive to the requirements of court ordered probation supervision. It is at this stage of the process that probation officers must get the attention of their new clients and make it clear to them what it will take to successfully complete their probation. Along with good communication skills this will require that they be thoroughly familiar with their agency's policies and procedures, forms and documents.

Probation officers must make sure that new probationers are oriented to the basic rules and regulations of their probation. They should make sure they have a copy of those rules and that they carefully go over the rules. They will also want to make sure that all questions that the new probationers have are answered. Failure to do this in an adequate manner can lead to misunderstandings and resentments, which may fester and grow throughout the probation process (Frazier, 1999).

Table 2 indicates how the surveyed probationers thought their probation officers had explained the rules of probation and had answered the questions they had about the intake process.

Table 2: Intake Process

Question in survey: When your were first put on probation, did your Intensive Probation Officer—	Response
1. Clearly explain the rules of probation to you?	97% - Yes
2. Clearly answer all of your questions?	99% - Yes
3. Clearly explain what is expected of you?	99% - Yes
4. Clearly answer your question when you have one?	97% - Yes

Results of the items pertaining to the intake process, contained in Table 2, strongly indicate that the new probationers were well satisfied with the initial encounter they had with their probation officer.

Reporting to Intensive Probation Officer

It is axiomatic that for probation agencies to be successful in managing their clients, those clients must interact with their assigned I.P.O., either within the context of an office visit, when they report; or in the community, when the I.P.O. visits the client at their home, employer, or educational facility. This is true whether the agency utilizes a casework supervision approach or brokerage supervision approach. Even though many agencies try to get their officers into the field more and out of the office, the heart of most community service supervision still remains the office visit. With this in mind, the survey questionnaire provided some focus on the experience of the probationer in reporting to their assigned I.P.O. and how they were treated during those important office visits. Table 3 depicts answers given to a variety of questions related to reporting to the Intensive Probation Officer.

Table 3: Reporting to Intensive Supervision Officer

Question in survey: When you report to see your Intensive Probation Officer—	Response
5. Are the secretaries polite to you?	99% - Yes
6. Do the secretaries wait on you as soon as possible?	98% - Yes
7. Do you think your Intensive Probation Officer makes you wait too long when you report?	5% - Yes
8. When you report on time to see your Intensive Supervision Officer, how long do you usually have to wait before he/she sees you?	
1. Less than 10 minutes	91%
2. 10-20 minutes	9%
3. 20-30 minutes	0
4. More than 30 minutes	0
9. When you report late or without a scheduled appointment, how long do you usually have to wait before he/she sees you?	
5. Less than 10 minutes	65%
6. 10-20 minutes	18%
7. 20-30 minutes	0
8. I have never been late or come in without a scheduled appointment	17%

Question in survey: When you call the Probation Department—	Response
10. Are the secretaries polite to you?	86% - Yes

11. Are you asked if you would like to leave a message when your Intensive Probation Officer is not available?	92% - Yes
12. When you call and leave a message for your Intensive Probation Officer, how long does it take for him/her to call you back?	
A. Less than 30 minutes	39%
B. 30 minutes to one hour	27%
C. 1-4 hours	6%
D. More than 4 hours	1%
E. He/she doesn't call me back	4%
F. Not applicable	14%
G. No response	9%

Question in survey: When your Intensive Probation is not available—	
13. Do you see another Intensive Probation Officer?	60% - Yes
14. Does your Intensive Probation Officer reschedule appointments often?	24% - Yes
15. Is he/she willing to reset your appointments when you have an emergency?	99% - Yes

As shown in Table 3, the experience of reporting to their I.P.O. was generally perceived to be a positive one in which the probationer was treated politely by agency staff, did not have to wait an unreasonable length of time to see their I.P.O., and enjoyed a certain level of flexibility on the part of the I.P.O. in rescheduling appointments when necessary.

Office Hours and Transportation

For some probationers under intensive supervision, scheduled office hours and transportation can at times be a problem. When placed on probation, there is a tendency to be somewhat overwhelmed with tasks to completed, from reporting, attending treatment programs, finding or maintaining employment, and attending to family matters. Hours of operation and the ability to get to scheduled appointments and activities is very important. Survey questions dealing with these issues are presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Office Hours & Transportation

Question in survey: In your opinion, the Probation Department—	
Response	
16. Is open long enough to make it easy for you to report to your Intensive Probation Officer?	95% - Yes
17. Should be open later in the evenings?	32% - Yes
18. Should be open on some of the weekends?	21% - Yes
19. The Intensive Probation Officer tries to schedule your appointments around your work or school schedule?	97% - Yes
20. Would you be willing to report later in the evenings if office were open?	71% - Yes
21. Would you be willing to report on Saturday if officer were open?	64% - Yes
22. When you have to do something for probation, (GED class, reporting, etc.), can you usually find a ride?	89% - Yes
23. Do you think the Probation Department should help you by providing a ride to get to required meetings or counseling?	31% - Yes

While most (95%) of the respondents reported that office hours were long enough to make it easy for them to report, a sizeable

portion of respondents did think that the office should be open later in the evenings (32%) or even on some of the weekends (21%). And, almost a third (31%) responded that they thought the Probation Office should help them by providing transportation to required meetings or counseling. This would seem to indicate that transportation, at least for some, is a real impediment to complying with the requirements of their probation.

Responsiveness of Intensive Probation Officers (I.P.O.)

One of the continuing controversies in probation supervision has to do with what is or what should be the nature of the role of the probation supervisor. Even after more than a century of probation supervision there still is no consensus as to what the role of a probation officer should be. These differences not only vary from agency to agency but also within agencies. Sometimes these differences have a legal basis such as in cases where states have officially defined the role of probation officer as 'peace officers'. These states emphasize the law enforcement role of probation officers (McShane & Krause, 1993). In other jurisdictions the rehabilitation philosophy, which utilizes social casework is promoted. Here probation officers are viewed as members of the 'helping professions'. Between these two sharply contrasting role models are even more role definitions that other probation officers and departments have staked out regarding appropriate supervision philosophies, policies and practices. Thus, the preferred role of probation officers continues to be a source of controversy and lively debate. Joining this debate are many academics and practitioners who have developed role typologies or in some fashion have contributed their views to this topic. Counted among these are Klockars (1972), Bartlett (1986), Barkdull (1978), Rosecrance (1987), Conrad (1982), Glaser (1964), and Tomaino (1975).

Some research has found that probation officers supervising Intensive Probation Supervision programs tend to emphasize surveillance and control more than probation officers who are supervising regular or other types of probation programs. Additionally, researchers have found that the longer these programs have been in operation the more the administrators emphasize the control aspects of probation supervision (Byrne, Kelly, et al., 1988). More support for that point was found in another research study by Byrne (1990) in which he concluded that over time surveillance tends to increase while treatment-oriented services remain at constant levels.

Regardless of the worthiness of the various viewpoints in the long-standing debate over the preferred role of probation officers, McShane and Krause (1993) have focused upon the key significance of the relationship between probation officers and their clients. In their discussion of what they consider to be the essential ingredient in probation supervision they concluded, "There is no doubt that the kind of relationship that develops between a community corrections agent and clients is critical to the success of any program." In a study cited earlier, Gibbs (1985), found that highest among probationer concerns were their stated needs for their supervisor to be flexible, supportive, and willing to provide assistance. He furthermore found that, although respondents voiced an appreciation for all officers to provide a measure of control, they still wanted their autonomy and privacy respected. Most probationers were well satisfied with their probation officers. Fewer than 15% considered their relationship with the officer to be negative. On the other hand three-fourths of clients who reported a beneficial aspect of probation said it was their client-officer relationship that was positive. Other research affirms the importance

of the relationship between probation officers and the clients they supervise. One of these research studies was conducted by Gendreau (1996) who examined hundreds of correctional and rehabilitation programs. He concluded his research on this issue by noting that one of the most distinguishing characteristics of effective programs involves those where . . . "therapists relate to offenders in interpersonally sensitive and constructive ways and are trained and supervised accordingly" (Gendreau, 1996).

Table 5 contains items used to survey the probationers regarding their relationship with their Intensive Probation Officer.

Table 5: Probation Officer – Client Relationship

Question in survey:	Response
24. Do you have a good relationship with your I.P.O.?	95% - Yes
25. Do you think you should change I.P.O.s every once in a while?	6% - Yes
26. Does your I.P.O. treat you fairly?	95% - Yes
27. Does your I.P.O. treat you with respect?	96% - Yes
28. Does your I.P.O. want to help you with your problems when you have them?	96% - Yes
29. Is the advice you get from your I.P.O. helpful?	97% - Yes
30. Does your time with your I.P.O. help you solve your problems?	92% - Yes
31. Has your I.P.O. helped you to succeed on probation?	94% - Yes
32. Would you like to spend more time with your I.P.O. if you could?	25% - Yes
33. If you were no longer on probation but still having problems in your life, would you call your I.P.O. for advice or help?	78% - Yes
34. Does the Probation Department offer enough help to meet your needs?	96% - Yes
35. Overall, will your time on probation help you stay out of trouble?	94% - Yes
36. Do you feel comfortable talking with your I.P.O. about problems involving your work?	95% - Yes
37. Involving your home life?	88% - Yes
38. Involving your financial situation?	91% - Yes

The results given in Table 5 strongly indicate the probationers were well satisfied with the relationship they had with their probation officer. They most strongly agreed with the items that their probation officers were respectful (96%) and fair (95%) to them; that they gave them good advice (97%); that they were willing to help them meet their needs (96%); and, that they helped them stay out of trouble (94%) and succeed on probation (94%). One probationer enthusiastically commented, "I was extremely bullheaded and my probation officer's constant reminding me about my dumb choices helped me over this time. I am so grateful I had this probation officer as a friend and P.O." Not only did the great majority (95%) indicate that they had a good relationship with their probation officer, few indicated interest in changing probation officers. Just a scant six percent (6%) thought it was a good idea for them to change probation officers from time to time.

Although these results indicate that the probationers were well satisfied with the relationship they had with their probation officers, at least two probationers clearly were not. They registered their disapproval with these comments: "I've been treated rudely and not like a human at all." and "My probation officer was 'rude

to me on many occasions". Furthermore, only a minority (25%) were interested in spending more time with their probation officer, if they could. Nor would they be inclined to ask for more assistance from their probation officer, once they were off probation. Although they were apparently very comfortable talking to their Intensive Probation Officer about problems involving their work (95%), they were clearly less enthusiastic talking to their I.P.O. about more personal matter such as problems in their financial situation (91%) or their home life (88%). In his research on the assessed effectiveness of probation supervision from the point of view of probationers, Studt (1978) found that the more the officer directed his efforts toward what the client considered a "personal affair" (i.e., "managing their social life"), the more probable the client would remember it as help given, but the less likely it would be remembered as help received. Thus, Studt concluded that the clients view their officers as helpful when they contribute to their survival in the community. But they do not appreciate either the officer's taking responsibility for supervising their personal lifestyles or for the relevance of what they feel are overly intrusive conditions. He concluded that it seems the clients favor a less intrusive form of supervision — one based on the treatment rather than the surveillance model. The findings of this current research apparently support that conclusion.

Probation Agency Services

It also seems that just about everyone who is involved in some fashion with probation supervision has an opinion about what makes for good and effective supervision programs. In summing up the research on this question, McShane and Krause (1993) have concluded that overall there appears to be three factors associated with successful Intensive Probation Supervision. These factors are that the programs have therapeutic integrity, be reasonable, and that offense-specific treatments be made available (McShane and Krause, 1993, p. 166). Whitfield (1990) underscored this last point — in his opinion, "Special programmes for sex offenders, drug abuse, auto-crime, etc. seem to have more credibility, a sharper focus and greater effect."

Probationers apparently agree that good and effective probation programs provide delivery of needed services. Studt, (1978) in his research discovered that the more practical and specific the agent's action (i.e., helping the client find a job), the more likely this action would be remembered by the client as helpful. The question is: Specifically, what probation supervision service programs can contribute to their clients' survival in the community? In answering this question, some experts have pointed to the key role that being gainfully employed plays in our society. Thus, some programs seek to aid probationers with their employment-related problems. Stressing the importance of employment K. Morgan (1993) in her research of probation outcomes concluded, "Those most likely to fail were unemployed or underemployed young males with low income and prior criminal record." Conversely, "Probationers who were adequately employed, married with children, and had lived in their area for at least two years were most often successful when placed on probation."

Nearly everyone concurs that many, probably most, probationers have drug and/or alcohol-related problems. Not surprisingly, most agencies include one or more programs designed to address problems of this kind. Such is the case in Kansas.

Table 6, provides the results of the probationers' assessment of their agency services. The clients' assessment of the Employment

Assistance they received from the agencies that supervised them appears in the first part of this table. This is followed by their assessment of the help they had in three other programs: Assistance Obtaining a GED, Alcohol and Drug Counseling and Referral to an In-Patient Drug or Alcohol Treatment program.

Table 6: Probation Agency Services

Question in survey: Response	
39. Has your I.P.O. ever tried to help you get a job?	54% - Yes
40. Should the Probation Department have someone help you get a job if you need one?	69% - Yes
41. Would you attend a class to teach people the skills needed to help them get a job, if the probation department held such a class?	65% - Yes
42. Have you ever been asked to attend GED class?	26% - Yes
43. Are you currently working on your GED?	21% - Yes
44. Would you attend GED class even if it weren't a condition of your probation?	100% - Yes
45. Does your Probation Department offer enough GED classes so that it is easy for you to attend?	86% - Yes
46. When you attend GED class, do you get the help you need?	92% - Yes
47. Do you believe that getting your GED will help you in the future?	100% - Yes
48. Has your I.P.O. ever referred you to attend alcohol/drug counseling?	65% - Yes
49. Do you think that the alcohol/drug counseling that you have attended helped or is helping you?	86% - Yes
50. Do you think the Probation Department offers enough alcohol/drug counseling?	88% - Yes
51. Has your I.P.O. ever referred you to an in-patient alcohol/drug abuse facility?	23% - Yes
52. Do you think that the I.P.O. was correct in sending you to an in-patient facility?	82% - Yes
53. Do you think that you have received the help you needed at the facility?	100% - Yes
54. Since being out of that facility, have you used any drugs or alcohol?	48% - Yes

Probationers do not seem to be overwhelmingly convinced that their probation officers have helped them get a job or even that they should have. Barely more than half (54%) reported that their I.P.O. had helped them get a job. Few more than two thirds of those surveyed thought the Probation Department should help them get a job (69%) or that they would attend a class to teach skills to help them get a job, if the Probation Department held such a class (65%). Their support for these items was noticeably less enthusiastic than it was for their assessment of their relationship with their probation officer.

Probationers are unanimous in their belief in education. All of them believe that getting their GED would help them in the future and all of them said they would attend a GED class even if it weren't a condition of their probation. Moreover, the great majority (92%) thought they had received the help they needed when they did attend GED classes. But, fewer (86%) thought that their Probation Department offered enough classes so that they could attend. Far fewer indicated that they had ever been asked to attend GED classes (26%) or that they were currently working on their GED (21%). The very strong belief in education and what it can do

for them does not appear to be matched by the delivery of these services.

Probationers for the most part appear to be convinced that drug and/or alcohol counseling programs are helpful (86%) and that there are a sufficient number of them (88%). Although most have never been referred to an in-patient alcohol/drug abuse facility (23%), those who have been referred to such institutions indicated unanimous agreement that they were helpful. Yet, they are considerably less convinced (82%) that their I.P.O. was correct in sending them there. Perhaps even more interesting and ironic is the finding that even though they all thought the institutions were helpful, nearly half (48%) admitted to using drugs or alcohol, since they left the treatment facility.

General Discussion

The correctional manager who examines the results of the survey will find welcome confirmation that the program is providing quality services in most areas and some hints of a need for potential needed changes in other areas. Some specific programmatic recommendations that could result from the survey include the following:

- The program could consider implementing a procedure that ensures that offenders who call the office receive a return call within 24 hours. Ten-percent reported that it took as long as 1-4 hours to be called back, and five-percent said they were never called back at all. Even if the supervising officer cannot call back in a timely manner, another staff person could let the offender know of the delay and offer assistance if needed.
- Extending office hours to include more evenings and even weekend hours could satisfy the needs of a significant portion of offenders. One third of the respondents thought the office should be open later in the evenings, and 21% even thought it would be helpful to have office hours available on the weekend.
- Additional assistance with transportation to and from probation required activities could be helpful. Thirty-one percent of the respondents thought that transportation should be provided by the probation department. While this may not be possible in all cases, certainly some additional use of local resources to assist with transportation may be possible and remove one more reason for failing to participate in required programs and activities.
- While the program received high marks, in general, with regard to the responsiveness of the probation officer to their clients, some troubling red flags could be further assessed to pinpoint possible problems. These areas show up graphically in the open-ended questions giving the respondent the opportunity to say in his/her own words what is on his/her mind. Comments like, "I've been treated rudely and not like a human at all," or "My probation officer was rude to me on many occasions" point to possible problems. The offenders making these type of comments could be the same ones who may be about to be revoked because of their own poor attitudes or behaviors, but their observations should not be totally discounted either. Effective programs should certainly have comprehensive training of staff on the goals and mission of the program, which includes effective ways of interacting with clients to promote rapport and motivation of the offenders to behave in a law abiding and productive manner. This relationship between the offender and probation officer is critical if positive change is to occur.
- Greater assistance in obtaining employment seems to be an area that could be improved upon, at least from the offender's per-

spective. Fifty-four percent of the respondents stated that their probation officer had tried to help them get a job. It is noted, however, that a portion of this group includes those who already have jobs and therefore do not need employment assistance. And 65% stated they "would attend a class to teach people the skills needed to help them get a job, if the probation department held such a class." Certainly, budgets and limited local resources may make it difficult, but greater efforts in this area could yield beneficial results.

- Finally, in the area of substance abuse treatment, most of the respondents thought that services were adequate. However, self-reports of the respondents indicated that 48% of the offenders who were referred for in-patient treatment programs admitted to using alcohol and/or drugs after discharge. Clearly, relapse is a part of alcohol and drug addiction, but probation programs who make referrals to and even contract with, treatment providers could require these providers to maintain and provide data on their outcomes over time to help assess their effectiveness.

Efficacy of Client-Centered Evaluation Measures

This exploratory study demonstrates the efficacy and utility of using a client-centered evaluation measure as one means of assessing a probation agency's effectiveness and responsiveness to the offender they serve. Probation reform under the banner of "reinventing probation" is sweeping the country. It is recognized that agencies cannot operate in the same manner they have in the past. New, and sometimes controversial, methods and techniques have to be tried. Methods employed by probation agencies have to be tied to research driven empirical studies that demonstrate what does and does not work in probation. Certainly there are many important stakeholders in the criminal justice system deserving attention, not the least of which are victims and their families, the community, justice officials, and practitioners. But the offender is one stakeholder that cannot be ignored in this process.

Future research with this client-centered evaluation tool should focus on a broader population of offenders. Additionally, the instrument itself should be further refined to better measure program responsiveness in key areas. One area of great importance is the relationship between the probation officer and the offender. Matching offender with supervision styles of probation officer is an area needing more study, especially as this relates to recidivism rates.

References

Allen, G., and Treger, H. (1994). "Fines and Restitution Orders: Probationers' Perceptions." *Federal Probation*, 58 (2), 34-40.

Allen, G. F. (1985). "The Probationers Speak: Analysis of the Probationers' Experiences and Attitudes." *Federal Probation*, September, 67-75.

Andrews, D., Zinger, I., Hoge, R., Bonta, J., Gendreau, P., and Cullen, F. (1990). "Does Correctional Treatment Work? A Clinically-relevant and Psychologically-informed Meta-analysis." *Criminology*, 28, 369-404.

Arcaya, J. (1973). "The Multiple Realities Inherent in Probation Counseling." *Federal Probation*, 37 (4), 58-63.

Barkdull, W. (1976). "Probation: Call It Control and Mean It." *Federal Probation*, 40 (4), 3-8.

Bartlett, K. (1986). "Parole Officers Play Schizophrenic Role." *Baton Rouge, Louisiana: Sunday Advocate*, 23 March, 3D.

Bingham, R. H. (1994). "Probationer Questionnaires: A Tool for Gathering Management Information." *Executive Exchange*, Winter, 3-7.

Byrne, J., L. Kelly, and Guarino-Ghezzi (1988). "Understanding the Limits of Technology: An Examination of the Use of Electronic Monitoring in the Criminal Justice System." *Perspectives*, Spring, 30-36.

Byrne, J. (1990). "The Future of Intensive Probation Supervision and the New Intermediate Sanctions." *Crime and Delinquency*, 36 (1), 6-41.

Conrad, J. (1982). "Can Probation be Rehabilitated?" *Federal Probation*, 46 (2), 3-8.

Crouch, B. M. (1993). "Is Incarceration Really Worse? Analysis of Offenders' Preferences for Prison over Probation." *Justice Quarterly*, 10 (1), 67-88.

Frazier, J. (1999). "Receiving and Discharge, Mail, and Records Management." In P. Carlson and J. Garrett (Eds.), *Prison and Jail Administration*. Aspen Publishers, Inc.: Gaithersburg, Maryland.

Gendreau, P. (1996). "The Principles of Effective Intervention with Offenders." In A. T. Harland (Ed.), *Choosing Correctional Options that Work: Defining the Demand and Evaluating the Supply* (pp. 117-130). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications.

Gibbs, J. J. (1985). "Clients' Views of Community Corrections." In L. F. Travis III (Ed.), *Probation, Parole, and Community Corrections - A Reader* (pp. 97-108). Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.

Glaser, D. (1969). *The Effectiveness of a Prison and Parole System*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Bobbs-Merrill.

Henningsen, R., Beto, D. R., Ross, T., and Bachrach, D. (1996). "The Probationer as a Customer: A Texas Survey." *Texas Probation*, January 12-17.

Klockars, C. (1972). "A Theory of Probation Supervision." *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science*, 63 550-557.

Leibrich, J. (1994). "What do Offenders Say about Supervision and Going Straight?" *Federal Probation*, 58 (2), 41-46.

Lipsey, M. (1992). "Juvenile Delinquency Treatment: A Meta-analytic Inquiry into the Variability of Effects." In T. Cook, H. Cooper, D. Cordray, H. Hartmann, L. Hedges, R. Light, T. Louis and F. Mosteller (Eds.), *Meta-analysis for Explanation* (pp. 83-127). New York: Russell Sage.

Martinson, R. (1974). "What Works? Questions and Answers about Prison Reform." *Public Interest*, 35, 22-54.

McShane, M. and W. Krause (1993). *Community Corrections*. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.

Morgan, K. (1993). "Factors Influencing Probation Outcome: A Review of the Literature." *Federal Probation*, 57 23-29.

Rosecrance, J. (1987). "Getting Rid of the Prima Donnas: The Bureaucratization of a Probation Department." *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 14 138-155.

Studt, E. (1978). *Surveillance and Service in Parole*. U.S. Department of Justice: National Institute of Corrections.

Tomaino, L. (1975). "The Five Faces of Probation." *Federal Probation*, 39 (4), 41-46.

Whitfield, R. (1990). "Probation — Does More Mean Better?" *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 34 (3), vii-xii.

NEWS FROM THE FIELD

WYETT RESIGNS AS CHAIR OF NEVADA PAROLE BOARD

On December 15, 2000, **Richard E. Wyett, Sr.**, resigned as Chairman of the Nevada Parole Board after serving in the \$78,000 a year job for approximately six months. Wyett, a member of the NAPE Board of Directors and a past recipient of the Sam Houston State University Executive of the Year Award, submitted a letter of resignation to Governor **Kenny Guinn**, citing "recent conflicts and allegations as well as my personal opinion about inappropriate activity that undermine the board's credibility." Wyett wrote further that "tolerating that activity would mean condoning it and I cannot in good conscience remain on the board knowing that I do not have the support of your office to halt this behavior."

The controversy surrounds another Guinn appointment to the Nevada Parole Board — **Tami Bass** — who was recently suspended for five days without pay for driving a vehicle during work hours while her driver's license was suspended. In addition, Bass has a misdemeanor conviction for welfare fraud, which resulted in a three year probation, and two judgments for more than \$26,000 in student loans.

According to the Governor, when he took office in January 1999 there were no procedures for checking backgrounds of people who wanted appointments. He said his administration started the inquiries when there were questions about a member named to the Nevada Wildlife Commission. The appointment of Bass came before the investigation procedure was started, Guinn said. He acknowledged that "a gap" existed in the appointment procedures.

Wyett had recommended that Bass be fired when all this information came to light. When he did not receive the support he sought from the Governor's Office, Wyett resigned rather than compromise his personal integrity.

Information for this news item came from issues of the *Las Vegas Sun*, *Las Vegas Review-Journal*, and *Reno Gazette-Journal*.

REINVENTING PROBATION COUNCIL MEMBER ACCEPTS WHITE HOUSE POST

On January 29, 2001, **John J. DiIulio, Jr.**, the driving force behind the reinventing probation movement, was appointed by President **George W. Bush** as Director of the newly created White House Office on Faith-based and Community Initiatives. In making the appointment, Bush said that DiIulio "is one of the most influential social entrepreneurs in America . . . He's the author of a well-respected textbook on American government. He has a servant's heart on the issues we will confront."

It will be the job of DiIulio to advance what Bush called "one of the great goals of my administration" — to find ways of funneling tax dollars to religious and community groups that do much to help the needy, especially in cities. "We will not fund religious activities of any group," Bush said after signing two executive orders while flanked by 35 Christian, Jewish, Muslim, and other sectarian leaders. "But when

people of faith provide social services, we will not discriminate against them."

DiIulio, the Frederick Fox Leadership Professor of Politics, Religion, and Civil Society at the University of Pennsylvania, is a Senior Fellow at the Manhattan Institute in New York, Senior Counsel at Public/Private Ventures in Philadelphia, and the Founding Director of the Brookings Institution's Center for Public Management in Washington, D.C. For several years DiIulio has directed the Jeremiah Project, an initiative of the Manhattan Institute's Center for Civic Innovation. As Director of the Jeremiah Project, DiIulio studied and assisted faith-based programs for inner-city youth and young adults, with a special emphasis on programs that focused on achieving literacy, avoiding violence, and accessing jobs.

In 1997 DiIulio convened a group of probation practitioners at the Manhattan Institute to assess the state of probation in America. As a result of that meeting, the Reinventing Probation Council was created and chaired by **Ronald P. Corbett, Jr.**, of Massachusetts. The Council produced two publications advocating a new course for probation — "*Broken Windows*" *Probation: The Next Step in Fighting Crime and Transforming Probation through Leadership: The "Broken Windows" Model*.

DiIulio is the author, co-author, or editor of a dozen books, including *Improving Government Performance: An Owner's Manual*, *Deregulating the Public Service: Can Government be Improved?*, *Body Count: Moral Poverty . . . and How to Win America's War Against Crime and Drugs*, *American Government: Institutions and Policies*, *Performance Measures for the Criminal Justice System*, and *Governing Prisons*.

In addition to articles in scholarly journals, he has written numerous op-eds for *The Wall Street Journal*, *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, and other major newspapers, and articles for popular magazines, including *The New Republic*, *The National Review*, *Commentary*, and *The Washington Monthly*. He is also a contributing editor of *The Weekly Standard*.

SALLING NAMED CHAIR OF NEVADA PAROLE BOARD

On December 29, 2000, NAPE member **Dorla Salling**, District Administrator with the Nevada Division of Parole and Probation, was appointed Chair of the Nevada Parole Board by Governor **Kenny Guinn**.

"Dorla Salling's experience and knowledge of the criminal justice system in Nevada make her an excellent choice for this post, and I'm confident she'll be an enormous asset to the Parole Board," Guinn said in making the announcement.

Salling has worked in the community corrections field for 25 years.

In her job as District Administrator, Salling supervised more than 100 parole and probation officers and support staff.

BRODERICK NAMED CHIEF IN MARICOPA COUNTY

On November 27, 2000, Presiding Superior Court Judge **Colin F. Campbell** appointed **Barbara Broderick** Chief Adult Probation

Officer for Maricopa County, Arizona. She replaces **Norm Helber**, who retired in September after eleven years as Chief.

Broderick has served for the last five years as the Adult Probation Services Division Director for the Arizona Supreme Court. Prior to that she was the Director of the New York State Division of Probation and Correctional Alternatives in Albany.

Broderick serves as chair of the Arizona Parents Commission on Drug Education and Prevention and is a national associate with the VERA Institute of Justice for sentencing and community corrections programs. She is also a consultant to the National Institute of Justice Peer Review Panel and its 21st Century Probation and Parole Focus Group. Broderick, a member of the National Association of Probation Executives, also serves as chair of the Awards Committee of the American Probation and Parole Association.

REPORTS RECEIVED

In November 2000, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP), a division of the U. S. Department of Justice, released two reports of interest to community corrections practitioners.

Safe From the Start: Taking Action on Children Exposed to Violence (NCJ 182789)

On June 22, 1999, Attorney General Janet Reno and Secretary of Health and Human Services Donna E. Shalala, with the leadership of Deputy Attorney General Eric Holder, brought together 150 practitioners and policymakers in a National Summit on preventing and reducing the negative impact of children's exposure to violence. *Safe From the Start: Taking Action on Children Exposed to Violence* is the result of that summit, and provides a blueprint for federal, state, and local action.

According to John J. Wilson, Acting Administrator of OJJDP, "the prevalence of violence in our communities, neighborhoods, and homes places children at high risk for exposure."

"The potential for harm to children exposed to violence is considerable. In the short term, children's lives are often radically disrupted when their parents, loved ones, or they themselves are harmed. A range of feelings is evoked, including helplessness, hopelessness, fear, and aggression, among others."

"The long term effects can be devastating, including difficulties in school, work, relationships, and physical and mental health problems. Children exposed to violence may be revictimized later in life, or they may become victimizers themselves, as studies indicate that children exposed to violence are at a greater risk of perpetrating violent acts."

"Convened by the U.S. Departments of Justice and Health and Human Services, the National Summit on Children Exposed to Violence brought experts together to develop a framework for understanding and addressing children's exposure to violence. This summary describes that framework, creating an action plan that outlines principles for preventing and reducing the negative impact of the exposure to violence on children."

"Through understanding the challenges, knowing the facts, constructing effective programs, and working across disciplines, we are taking a significant step toward ensuring a safe start for all children."

This Action Plan contains information on resources available to address the issue of children's exposure to violence, including many publications from the U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ). All DOJ publications cited in this Action Plan are available from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

1998 National Youth Gang Survey (NCJ 183109)

"The spread of youth gang activity across American has led to increased public concern," writes John J. Wilson, Acting Administrator of OJJDP. "In 1995 the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention launched a series of annual surveys to facilitate analysis of changes and trends in the nature of youth gangs and their activities."

"The fourth in this series, the 1998 National Youth Gang Survey was administered by the National Youth Gang Center to a representative sample of city and county jurisdictions. To facilitate comparative analysis, the 1998 survey used the same sample as its 1996 and 1997 predecessors."

"This summary provides the results of the 1998 survey, which indicates that the percentage of jurisdictions reporting active youth gangs decreased from the previous year, from 51 percent in 1997 to 48 percent in 1998. An estimated 780,200 gang members were active in 28,700 youth gangs in 1998, a decrease from the previous year's figures of 816,000 and 30,500, respectively. Despite these declines, and similar declines from 1996 to 1997, gangs remain a serious problem. For example, every city with a population of 250,000 or greater reported the presence of youth gangs, as they did in 1996 and 1997. In addition, the number of gang members increased 43 percent in rural counties from 1996 to 1998, as youth gang participation continued to spread beyond the confines of the Nation's major cities."

"Awareness of such data is crucial to understanding the nature of America's gang problem and to successfully addressing it. The findings of the 1998 National Youth Gang Survey featured in this Summary should enhance our efforts to combat youth gangs."

Most DOJ publications may be downloaded from the NCJRS Justice Information Center Website at <www.ncjrs.org>. All NCJRS publications may be ordered from NCJRS by mail, phone, or fax, or online, as follows:

Mail:	NCJRS Publication Orders P. O. Box 6000 Rockville, Maryland 20849-6000
Telephone:	(800) 851-3420
Fax:	(410) 792-4358
Online:	www.ncjrs.org/puborder

When ordering, use the National Criminal Justice (NCJ) reference number noted at the end of the publication citation.

HOLLAND PASSES AWAY

Long-time NAPE member E. Dean Holland died on January 27, 2001. Holland served as Director of the Orleans County Probation Department in New York from 1989 until he retired in December 1999 at the age of 70. In addition to membership in NAPE, Holland was a member of the New York State Council of Probation Administrators. Our condolences go out to his wife Sue and family members.

INNOVATIVE TECHNOLOGIES FOR COMMUNITY CORRECTIONS CONFERENCE SCHEDULED

The National Law Enforcement and Corrections Technology Center - Rocky Mountain Region (NLECTC-RM) will host a conference on innovative technologies for community corrections at the Doubletree Hotel Lincoln Center in Dallas, Texas, on May 21-22, 2001. There will be a \$50.00 registration fee for the two day conference, which covers lunch for both days. Agency administrators interested in technologies that can enhance mission performance are encouraged to attend. Registration packets are available by calling Joe Russo at (800) 416-8086.

WATERS ASSUMED NEW POSITION

Kathy Waters, Deputy Director of the Oklahoma Department of Corrections, has been named Division Director of Adult Probation Services for the Arizona Supreme Court. She replaces Barbara Broderick, who has assumed the position of Chief of the Maricopa County Adult Probation Department in Phoenix, Arizona.

In addition to being a member of the National Association of Probation Executives, Waters is President-elect of the American Probation and Parole Association.

PLUMLEE NAMED DIRECTOR IN FORT WORTH

Tom Plumlee, who has served as Director of the Potter County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Amarillo, Texas, for the past 15 years, has been named Director of the Tarrant County Community Supervision and Corrections Department in Fort Worth, Texas. He replaces Don R. Smith, who retired last year after four decades of service to the community corrections profession.

GOETHALS RECOGNIZED

During the 2001 Annual Conference of the Texas Probation Association held recently in Austin, NAPE Board member Ron R. Goethals, Director of the Dallas County Community Supervision and Corrections Department, was presented with the President's Award for his distinguished service to the probation profession.

Last year the National Association of Probation Executives recognized Goethals as the Probation Executive of the Year and presented him with the Sam Houston State University Award.

NEW MEMBERS JOIN

Since the last issue of Executive Exchange was published, 15 new individual members joined the Association; they are as follows:

Larry D. Blaisdell, Director, New Hampshire Division of Field Services, P.O. Box 1806, Concord, New Hampshire 03302-1806.

Loren Buddress, Chief Probation Officer, San Mateo County Probation Department, 21 Tower Road, San Mateo, California 94402.

Wynette P. Carter, Chief Probation Officer, Clark County Juvenile Court, 101 East Columbia Street, Springfield, Ohio 45502.

Stephanie B. Chambers, Chief Probation Officer, Franklin County Adult Probation Department, 373 South High Street, 10th Floor, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

Gary L. Clark, Director, Genesee County Probation Department, County Building I, 15 Main Street, Batavia, New York 14020.

Thomas N. Costa, Eastern Regional Director, Pennsylvania Board of Probation and Parole, 1400 Spring Garden Street, Room 1005, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19130.

Kathleen Graves, Director, Community Corrections, Kansas Department of Corrections, 900 SW Jackson Street, Suite 400, Topeka, Kansas 66612.

Harry Hageman, Deputy Director, Parole and Community Services, Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Correction, 1050 Freeway Drive North, Columbus, Ohio 43229.

J. Hancuch, Director, Isanti County Court Services, 555 18th Avenue SW, Cambridge, Minnesota 55008.

Scott Johnston, Assistant Division Director, Board of Probation and Parole, 1511 Christy Drive, Jefferson City, Missouri 65101.

Suzanne M. LaRue, Deputy Director, Pinal County Juvenile Court Services, P.O. Box 1009, Florence, Arizona 85232.

Ed Ligtenberg, Director of Parole, Board of Pardons and Paroles, P.O. Box 5911, Sioux Falls, South Dakota 57117-5911.

Doug Missman, Chief Probation Officer, Community Corrections, 137 North Sandusky Street, Delaware, Ohio 43015.

Robert Sanders, Deputy Secretary, Division of Community and Field Services, Kansas Department of Corrections, 900 SW Jackson Street, Suite 451-S, Topeka, Kansas 66612-1284.

Judd C. Thompson, Chief Court Services Officer, 7th Circuit Court, P.O. Box 230, Rapid City, South Dakota 57709-0230.

In addition to the individual members, one organizational member joined:

New York State Division of Probation and Correctional Alternatives, (Sara Tullar Fasoldt, Executive Deputy Director), 4 Tower Place, Albany, New York 12203.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF PROBATION EXECUTIVES

Who We Are

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

What We Do

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

Why Join

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

Types of Membership

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

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

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

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

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

Membership Application (TAX # 58-1497263)

NAME _____ TITLE _____

AGENCY _____

ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE # _____ FAX # _____ E-MAIL _____

DATE OF APPLICATION _____

Table with 4 columns: CHECK, Regular, Organizational, Corporate, and corresponding rates for 1, 2, and 3 years.

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

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



SAM HOUSTON PRESS & COPY CENTER 2001

Sam Houston State University
A Member of The Texas State University System